

VOL. VI. (XXV.)
1875.

[THIRD SERIES.]

NO. XXI. (CXXXV.)
SEPTEMBER.

THE MONTH

AND

CATHOLIC REVIEW.



LONDON:

SIMPKIN, MARSHALL, AND CO.

BURNS AND OATES.

DUBLIN: W. H. SMITH AND SON; W. B. KELLY; M'GLASHAN AND GILL.

GLASGOW: H. MARGEY. BRUSSELS: V. DEVAUX. PARIS: A. XAVIER.

BALTIMORE: KELLY AND PIET. NEW YORK: P. O'SHEA.

NEW YORK AND MONTREAL: D. AND J. SADLIER.

Price Two Shillings.

All rights of translation and reproduction reserved.

NOTICE TO AMERICAN SUBSCRIBERS.

ENQUIRIES having reached us as to the *price* at which *The Month and Catholic Review* is to be obtained in the United States and Canada, we have to state that Subscribers who *pay in advance* may receive it by post from the Office in London (50, South Street, Grosvenor Square), at the same price as in Great Britain, *i.e.*, 24/- per annum. Orders to be made in favour of Mr. JOSEPH HAGUE.

ST. JOSEPH'S CATHOLIC LENDING LIBRARY, 50, South Street, Grosvenor Square.

OPEN DAILY FROM HALF-PAST TEN TO FIVE O'CLOCK.

TERMS.

I. For Subscribers who pay in advance :

Two Shillings	1 Vol.	at a time for a Month.
Six Shillings	3 Vols.	„ for One Quarter.
	or 1 Vol.	„ for Half a Year.
Half a Guinea	3 Vols.	„ for Half a Year.
	or 1 Vol.	„ for a Year.
One Guinea	3 Vols.	„ for a Year.
	In the Country 4 Vols.	„ for a Year.
Five Guineas (for Families in the country or Depôts in town or country).....	25 Vols.	„ for a Year.

II. For Casual Readers who pay in advance :

Threepence—1 Vol. at a time, which may be kept a week.

III. For all who do not pay in advance :

Sixpence for 1 Vol. at a time, and Postage Expenses incurred in recovering Arrears.

CATHOLIC BOOK CLUBS.

FOR the convenience of Catholics residing in the country, the Managers of St. Joseph's Library are willing to make arrangements for *Catholic Book Clubs*, by means of which three or four families can combine their subscriptions, and enjoy the advantage of a greater variety of books at the same time. Terms can be ascertained by communication with the Managers, at the above address.

REGISTERS FOR GOVERNESSES, AND OTHERS REQUIRING SITUATIONS.

The Managers of St. Joseph's Library have also for some time opened a Register for Catholic Governesses, and are in constant communication with families seeking the services of such ladies. They also receive the names of servants wanting employment, and keep a list of vacant situations. *No fees whatever are charged, except for postage.*

re
rs
h
n.

,

f
t
-
e
e

l
n
e

NEW AND FORTHCOMING WORKS.

Manresa Press, September, 1875.

Ready in the middle of September.

The Chronicle of St. Antony of Padua,

"THE ELDEST SON OF ST. FRANCIS."

EDITED BY H. J. COLERIDGE,

Of the Society of Jesus.

IN FOUR BOOKS.

BOOK I. THE TRAINING OF A GREAT PREACHER.

„ II. EIGHT YEARS OF WORK.

„ III. THE LAST YEAR OF A SHORT LIFE.

„ IV. THE GLORY OF A FAITHFUL SERVANT.

Price 5s.

(This Volume forms the Michaelmas Number of the "Quarterly Series.")

BURNS & OATES, PORTMAN STREET & PATERNOSTER ROW.

*(Lately Published.)***THE PUBLIC LIFE OF OUR LORD JESUS CHRIST.**

VOLS. 1 AND 2.

I. The Ministry of St. John Baptist.

6s. 6d.

CONTENTS.

Chap.

1. Mission of St. John Baptist.
2. Preaching and Baptism of St. John.
3. Baptism of our Lord.
4. Fasting of our Lord.
5. Temptations of our Lord.
6. The Ministering Angels.
7. The Testimony of St. John.
8. The Lamb of God.
9. The First Disciples.
10. The Return to Galilee.
11. The Marriage at Cana.
12. Water made Wine.
13. The Beginning of Signs.
14. Miracles in Scripture and in the Church.
15. True and False Miracles.

Chap.

16. Miracles and Faith.
17. Capharnaum.
18. The Cleansing of the Temple.
19. Our Lord at the Feast.
20. Nicodemus.
21. Last Witness of St. John Baptist.
22. The Friend of the Bridegroom.
23. The Samaritan Woman.
24. Sowers and Reapers.
25. The Nobleman's Son.
26. The Synagogue at Nazareth.
27. The Imprisonment of St. John Baptist.

APPENDIX—Harmony of the Gospels as to the Ministry of St. John.

2. The Preaching of the Beatitudes.

6s. 6d.

CONTENTS.

Chap.

1. General Features of our Lord's Preaching.
2. Fishers of Men.
3. The Synagogue at Capharnaum.
4. The Demoniac in the Synagogue.
5. Miracles at Capharnaum.
6. Preaching through Galilee.
7. Illustrations of our Lord's preaching from the Lives of the Saints.
8. The Sermon on the Mount.
9. The Beatitudes.
10. The Beatitude of the Poor in Spirit.
11. Poverty in Spirit and the Kingdom of Heaven.
12. The Beatitude of the Meek.

Chap.

13. The Meek possessing the Land.
14. The Beatitude of the Mourners.
15. Consolation of the Mourners.
16. Hunger and Thirst after Justice.
17. The Satisfaction of Justice.
18. The Beatitude of the Merciful.
19. The Merciful receiving mercy.
20. The Beatitude of the Clean of Heart.
21. Purity and the Vision of God.
22. The Beatitude of the Peacemakers.
23. The Sons of God.
24. The Beatitude of the Persecuted.
25. Persecution and the Kingdom of Heaven.
26. Our Lord and the Beatitudes.

(The Third Volume will be issued at Christmas).

BURNS & OATES, PORTMAN STREET & PATERNOSTER ROW.

(Third Edition.)

The history of the Sacred Passion.

BY FATHER LUIS DE LA PALMA,

Of the Society of Jesus.

EDITED BY THE REV. H. J. COLERIDGE.

Price 7s. 6d.

(Preparing for Publication.)

THE LIFE OF OUR LORD JESUS CHRIST.

BY LUDOLPH THE CARTHUSIAN.

TRANSLATED INTO ENGLISH.

The First Volume of the English Version of this famous Work, containing

The Infancy and Hidden Life of our Lord,

will be ready for Christmas, 1875.

Vita Vitae Nostrae

MEDITANTIBUS PROPOSITA.

BY THE REV. HENRY J. COLERIDGE.

Cloth, 7s. 6.; Calf, 10s. 6d.

An English Edition in preparation.

BURNS & OATES, PORTMAN STREET & PATERNOSTER ROW.

*(Just Published.)***Sermons by Fathers of the Society of Jesus.**

VOL. III.

CONTENTS.

Sermons by the Rev. G. R. Kingdon: I. What the Passion of Christ teaches us. II. Our Lord's Agony in the Garden. III. The Choice between Jesus and Barabbas. IV. Easter Sunday (1). V. Easter Sunday (2). VI. Corpus Christi.

Sermons by the Rev. Edward I. Purbrick: VII. Grandeur and Beauty of the Holy Eucharist. VIII. Our Lady of Victories. IX. The Feast of All Saints (1). X. The Feast of All Saints (2). XI. The Feast of the Immaculate Conception. XII. The Feast of St. Joseph.

Sermons by the Rev. Henry J. Coleridge: XIII. XIV. XV. XVI. Fruits of Holy Communion. (Four Sermons.)

Sermons by the Rev. Alfred Weld: XVII. On the Charity of Christ. XVIII. On the Blessed Sacrament.

Sermons by the Rev. William H. Anderdon. XIX. The Corner Stone a Rock of Offence. XX. The Word of God heard or rejected by Men.

Price 6s.

*(Just Published.)***The Troubles of our Catholic Forefathers,**

RELATED BY THEMSELVES.

Second Series.

This volume consists of two parts, which closely bear on one another.

1. THE LIFE OF FATHER WILLIAM WESTON, S.J., in which is embodied the translation of the whole of his Latin Autobiography. The original Manuscript and the copy of it taken by Father Laurenson nearly a century ago, both belong to Stonyhurst. Father Weston was for seventeen years in English prisons in the time of Queen Elizabeth, after two years had been spent by him in the active duties of the mission. His Life may be regarded as an instalment of the history of the days of persecution, into the details of which it enters with much minuteness.

2. THE FALL OF ANTHONY TYRRELL was prepared for the Press by Father Persons in the words of the narrative drawn up by Tyrrell himself. It is thus the autobiographical account of the singular life of a man who three times fell from the Church and who lived among Catholics as a spy. From it the fullest insight may be obtained into the manner in which pressure was brought to bear upon wavering Catholics by Elizabeth's Ministers of State, and into the use that was made of such instruments. The original is preserved in the English College at Rome, and a copy has been recently sent to the Public Record Office by the Reverend Joseph Stevenson, which the Editor has been permitted to use.

Demy 8vo. Price 14s.

*(Lately Published.)***Peace through the Truth:**

OR,

ESSAYS ON SUBJECTS CONNECTED WITH DR. PUSEY'S "EIRENICON."

BY THE REV. THOMAS HARPER, S.J.

Second Series. Demy 8vo. Price 21s.

BURNS & OATES, PORTMAN STREET & PATERNOSTER ROW.

Quarterly Series.

(Conducted by the Managers of the "Month.")

1. *The Life and Letters of St. Francis Xavier.* By the Rev. H. J. COLERIDGE. Vol. I. Second edition. Price 7s. 6d.
2. *The Life of St. Jane Frances Fremyot de Chantel.* By EMILY BOWLES. With Preface by the Rev. H. J. COLERIDGE. Second edition. Price 5s. 6d.
3. *The History of the Sacred Passion.* By Father LUIS DE LA PALMA, of the Society of Jesus. Translated from the Spanish. With Preface by the Rev. H. J. COLERIDGE. Second edition. Price 7s. 6d.
4. *Life and Letters of St. Francis Xavier.* By the Rev. H. J. COLERIDGE. Vol. II., 10s. 6d.
5. *Ierne of Armorica: A Tale of the Time of Chlovis.* By J. C. BATEMAN. 6s. 6d.
6. *The Life of Doña Luisa de Carvajal.* By Lady GEORGIANA FULLERTON. 6s.
7. *The Life of the Blessed John Berchmans.* By the Rev. F. GOLDIE. 6s.
8. *The Life of the Blessed Peter Favre,* First Companion of St. Ignatius Loyola. From the Italian of Father BOERO. With Preface by the Rev. H. J. COLERIDGE. 6s. 6d.
9. *The Dialogues of St. Gregory the Great.* An Old English version. Edited by the Rev. H. J. COLERIDGE, S.J. 6s.
10. *The Life of Anne Catharine Emmerich.* By HELEN RAM. With Preface by Rev. H. J. COLERIDGE, S.J. 5s.
11. *The Prisoners of the Temple; or, Discrowned and Crowned.* By M. O'C. MORRIS. With Preface by Rev. H. J. COLERIDGE, S.J. 4s. 6d.
12. *The Public Life of our Lord Jesus Christ.* Part I. "The Ministry of St. John Baptist." By the Rev. H. J. COLERIDGE, S.J. 6s. 6d.
13. *The Story of St. Stanislaus Kostka.* Edited by the Rev. H. J. COLERIDGE, S.J. 3s. 6d.
14. *The Public Life of our Lord Jesus Christ.* Part II. "The Preaching of the Beatitudes." By the Rev. H. J. COLERIDGE, S.J. Price 6s. 6d.

Remarks on a late Assailant of the Society of Jesus.

REPRINTED FROM THE "MONTH AND CATHOLIC REVIEW."

Price 2s.

BURNS & OATES, PORTMAN STREET & PATERNOSTER ROW.

St. Joseph's Ascetical Library.

(Edited by Fathers of the Society of Jesus.)

1. *Of Adoration in Spirit and in Truth.* By JOHN EUSEBIUS NIEREMBERG, S.J. With a Preface by the Rev. PETER GALLWEY. Price 6s.
2. *A Remembrance for the Living to Pray for the Dead.* By Father J. MUMFORD, S.J. Reprinted from the Author's improved edition, published in Paris, 1661; with an Appendix on the Heroic Act, by the Rev. J. MORRIS. Price 2s.
3. *The Virtues of Blessed Mary, the Mother of Jesus.* By Father FRANCIS ARIAS. With Preface by the Rev. GEORGE PORTER. Cloth, 2s. 6d.
4. *A Guide to the Members of the Spiritual Union,* established by the Ven. Domenico Gesu e Maria, General of the Discalced Carmelites. *The Last Testament of the Soul;* By S. CHARLES BORROMEO, Cardinal Archbishop of Milan. *Spiritual Contract of the Soul with God;* By Father ALVARO ARIAS, S.J. Translated from the Italian. One Vol. Price 1s. 6d.
5. *The Devotions of the Lady Lucy Herbert of Powis,* formerly Prioress of the Augustinian Nuns at Bruges. Edited by the Rev. J. MORRIS. Price 3s. 6d.
6. *A Hundred Meditations on the Love of God.* By ROBERT SOUTHWELL, of the Society of Jesus, Priest and Martyr. An entirely original work, now first published. With Portrait. Edited, with a Preface, by the Rev. J. MORRIS. Price 6s. 6d.
7. *A Treatise on the Particular Examen of Conscience,* according to the method of St. Ignatius. By Father LUIS DE LA PALMA. Author of the "History of the Sacred Passion." With Preface by the Rev. GEORGE PORTER. Price 2s. 6d.
8. *A Spiritual Compendium,* in which the Principal Difficulties in the Way of Perfection are Explained. By Father GASPAR DE LA FIGUERA, of the Society of Jesus. Translated from the Spanish by Mrs. R. BENNETT. Edited by the Rev. GEORGE PORTER. Price 4s. 6d.
9. *Meditations for every day in the Year and for the Principal Feasts.* By the Ven. Father NICHOLAS LANCICIUS, of the Society of Jesus. With Preface by the Rev. GEORGE PORTER. Price 6s. 6d.
10. *The Perfect Lay-Brother.* By FELIX CUMPLIDO, of the Society of Jesus. Translated by the Rev. JOHN MACLEOD.
11. *Purgatory Surveyed;* or, A Particular Account of the happy, and yet thrice unhappy, state of the Souls there. Edited by the Rev. W. H. ANDERDON. Reprinted from the Edition of 1663.
- 12 and 13. *Meditations on the Life and Doctrine of Jesus Christ for every Day in the Year.* By NICHOLAS AVANCINUS, S.J. With a Preface by the Rev. GEORGE PORTER. Two Vols. Price 10s. 6d.

BURNS & OATES, PORTMAN STREET & PATERNOSTER ROW.

Periodicals Edited by Fathers of the Society of Jesus.

LA CIVILTÀ CATTOLICA.

7 Agosto 1875.

I. L'incertezza dell'avvenire. II. Se la volontà umana vien determinata dall'ultima giudizio pratico secondo san Tommaso. III. I destini di Roma. IV. Rivista della stampa Italiana. V. Bibliografia. VI. Cronaca contemporanea. —Roma. Cose Romane. Cose Italiane. Cose Straniere—Spagna. Austria. Belgio. Russia. Firenze, Presso Luigi Manuelli Libraio.

ETUDES.

Religieuses, Philosophiques, Historiques et Littéraires.

Août, 1875.

I. St. Louis et L'Eglise de France au XIIIe Siècle. II. Les Sociétés Secrètes en Chine. III. Le P. Alexis Clerc, de la Compagnie de Jésus. IV. Questions sur le Syllabus.—Soumission due au Syllabus. V. Philologie et Tradition. VI. Deux Lettres Inédites de St. Vincent de Paul. VII. Bibliographie. VII. Chronique.

Lyon: Lecoffre Fils and Cie, Libraires.
Paris: J. Albanel & Ed. Baltenweck.

STIMMEN AUS MARIA-LAACH.

Jahrgang, 1875.

Die Regierungen und die Papstwahl. IV. Die Exclusive. P. Th. Granderath, S.J. Die Philosophie der Vorzeit in ihrer Bedeutung für die Zukunft. P. T. Besch, S.J. Felibre und Felibrige. Studien über die provenzalische Literatur der Gegenwart. IV. Frederi Mistral. P. W. Kreiten, S.J. Die Abstammung des Menschen nach Darwin und Hæckel. Fortsetzung. P. H. Kemp, S.J. Ein Ausflug in das Land der Seen. P. A. Baumgartner, S.J. Recensionen. Dr. H. Zschokke, Das Buch Job, übersetzt und erklärt. P. J. Knabenbauer, S.J. H. E. Manning, Archbishop of Westminster, The Internal Mission of the Holy Ghost. P. A. Baumgartner, S.J. H. Düntzer, Charlotte von Stein, Goethe's Freundin. P. J. B. Diel, S.J. R. Ebner, S.J., Beleuchtung ver Schrift des Herrn Dr. Johann Kelle: "Die Jesuiten-Gymnasien in Desterreich." P. Fr. Miller, S.J. Miscellen. Ein amerikanischer "Heiliger" in Berlin.—Kinderhandel in America.—In Bezug auf den Caci-lienverein.

Freiburg im Breisgau: Herder'sche Berlagshandlung.

Messenger of the Sacred Heart of Jesus.

Organ of the Apostleship of Prayer.

THIRD SERIES.—AUGUST, 1875.

CONTENTS: Intention for August—The Keeping of the Sunday holy. Some Thoughts on the Revivals of Messrs. Moody and Sankey. Poetry: Queen of Angels; "An offering of a true heart will I give Thee;" Hymns before and after Distribution of Prizes. Piety according to the Heart of Jesus. On the Last Four Words spoken on the Cross. Chapters II.—IV. Interests of the Heart of Jesus. Home Record.

BURNS & OATES, PORTMAN STREET & PATERNOSTER ROW.

THE IRISH ECCLESIASTICAL RECORD,

A Monthly Journal,

CONDUCTED BY A SOCIETY OF CLERGYMEN UNDER EPISCOPAL SANCTION.

No. CXXIX., Vol. XII. July, 1875.

CONTENTS: Catholic Discipline and Modern Medicine. The Irish Paschal Question. Correspondence: "Kenmare Jubilee Manual." The Duties of Christian Subjects. Document of the Pope regarding the late Prosper Gueranger.

DUBLIN: WILLIAM B. KELLY, 8, GRAFTON STREET & 4, LOWER ORMOND-QUAY.
LONDON: BURNS & OATES, 17, PORTMAN STREET, W.

BOURNEMOUTH.

Boys prepared for Stonyhurst, Catholic University College, &c., by a married Graduate of Cambridge; also for the Civil Service and the Professions. Especial attention given to delicate boys, for whom the climate of Bournemouth is recommended.

Address, B.A., 2, Westburn Terrace, Bournemouth.

BURNS & OATES' NEW PUBLICATIONS.

The Holy Ways of the Cross; or a Short Treatise on the various Trials and Afflictions, interior and exterior, to which the Spiritual Life is subject, and the means of making a good use thereof. Translated from the French of HENRI-MARIE BOUDON, Archdeacon of Evreux, by EDWARD HEALY THOMPSON, M.A. Being Vol. III. of *Select Translations for Spiritual Reading*. 3s. 6d.

Previous Vols. in same Series.

I. *The Hidden Life of Jesus*, a Lesson and Model to Christians. Translated from the French of HENRI-MARIE BOUDON, by EDWARD HEALY THOMPSON, M.A. Second edition, 3s.

II. *Devotion to the Nine Choirs of Holy Angels*, and especially to the Angel Guardians. Also from the French of HENRI-MARIE BOUDON, by the same. 3s.

***The Spiritual Conflict and Conquest*.** By Dom J. CASTANIZA, O.S.B. Edited with Preface and Notes by Canon VAUGHAN, English Monk of the Order of St. Benedict. Reprinted from the old English Translation of 1652. With fine original Frontispiece, reproduced in Autotype. Second edition, enlarged, with a second Preface on Meditation and Effective Prayer. Price 8s. 6d.

***Catholic Church and Christian State*.** Historical Essays on the Relation of the Church to the Civil Power. Translated, with the Author's permission, from the German of Dr. HERGENRÖTHER, Professor of Canon Law and Ecclesiastical History at the University of Wurzburg. Two vols. Price 20s.

***Readings from the Old Testament*.** Arranged, with Explanatory Notes and Maps, for the use of Students. By JOHN GEORGE WENHAM, Canon of Southwark. Parts III. and IV., containing the "Kings" and the "Prophets," price 3s.

Also by the same,

***Parts I. and II.* The Patriarchs and the Israelites to the end of "Judges."** Price 1s. 6d.

Indulgences, the Neglect of. By WILLIAM GOWAN TODD, Canon of Southwark. Price 4d.

St. Gertrude, the Life and Revelations of. By the Author of *St. Francis and the Franciscans*, &c. With Frontispiece engraved from the Spanish Miraculous Painting. Second edition, 1 Vol., 595 pp. 7s. 6d.

The Bible and the Rule of Faith. By Abbé LOUIS NAZAIRE BEGIN, D.D., Professor of Theology in the University of Laval. Translated from the French by G. M. WARD. With the Imprimaturs of the Cardinal Archbishop and the Archbishop of Quebec. 1 Vol., crown 8vo. (Nearly ready).

***The Sacrifice of the Eucharist, and other Doctrines of the Catholic Church*, Explained and Vindicated.** By the Rev. CHARLES B. GARSIDE, M.A. Author of the *Prophet of Carmel*, &c. With the Imprimatur of the Cardinal Archbishop. (Nearly ready).

Contents of Section I.—THE SACRIFICE OF THE EUCHARIST.— Chap. 1. The Words of Christ to His Apostles at the Institution of the Eucharist. 2. The Words of Christ to the Samaritan Woman. 3. Melchisedech; and the Teaching of St. Paul. 4. The Prophecy of Malachias. 5. Sacerdotal Language in the New Testament. 6. The Sacrifice on the Cross, and the Sacrifice of the Altar. 7. The Eucharist as a Commemorative Sacrifice. 8. The Sacrificial Immolation; and the Priesthood. 9. Christian Worship, and the Christian Sacrifice. 10. The Unity of the Church and the Sacrifice. 11. The Laity and the Sacrifice. 12. The Propitiatory Character of the Sacrifice. 13. Miscellaneous Remarks, and Conclusion. COMMUNION IN ONE KIND.—Chap. 1. The Argument from Scripture. 2. The Practice of the Church. 3. The Communion of the Sick. 4. The Communion of young Children. 5. Conclusion.

Heads of Section II.— 1. Definitions of the Catholic Faith. 2. Existence of the Church in Relation to Scripture. 3. Tradition as a Vehicle of Christian Doctrine. 4. The Atonement and Purgatory. 5. Good Works. 6. St. Bonaventura, and the Psalter of the Blessed Virgin. 7. Reply to a Protestant; treating of the Scriptures, the Blessed Virgin, Transubstantiation, Absolution, &c. 8. Reply to Clericus; on Confession; Prayers for the Dead, &c.

BURNS & OATES, PORTMAN STREET & PATERNOSTER ROW.

Structure of St. Matthew's Gospel.

PART THE THIRD.

I.

THE confession of St. Peter as to the Divinity of our Blessed Lord is undeniably a turning point in the whole Gospel history. It brings out the first mention of the Church and of the Passion from the lips of our Lord, and gives a new direction to His teaching and to His conduct. That it was felt from the first to be such a turning point may be proved from the marked manner in which the three first Evangelists introduce it in connection with our Lord's declaration concerning His future Passion. It is not indeed mentioned by St. John, but that Evangelist introduces the very similar confession of faith made by the same Apostle only a short time before, when after the long discourse on the doctrine of the Blessed Sacrament in the synagogue at Capharnaum, our Lord asked His disciples whether they also would leave Him as others had left Him, and St. Peter declared that they had believed and knew that He was the Christ, the Son of the Living God. St. John's Gospel being so largely made up of discourses founded on incidents which are mentioned for the sake of the discourses themselves, does not stop to mark, as is the case with the other three, the chief stages in our Lord's career of preaching, such as the Sermon on the Mount, the Parables, the mission of the Twelve, and the like. It is therefore the more significant that even in that Gospel we have the great confession of St. Peter introduced in the same words in which it was made near Cæsarea Philippi, only not on so formal an occasion, and not in answer to a distinct question put by our Lord. We have now therefore reached, in our analysis of St. Matthew's Gospel, a point which we may certainly consider to have been a landmark to him as well as to ourselves, and we may proceed to examine the chapters which intervene between this and the next great point in the history which all the Evangelists unite

in mentioning, the object of our examination being to endeavour to trace the principle upon which these intervening chapters have been arranged.

This next great point is the solemn entry of our Lord into Jerusalem on Palm Sunday, which is to all the four Evangelists the natural introduction to the history of the Holy Week and the Passion itself. It is not difficult to fix the interval of time which must have passed between the confession of St. Peter and the Passion. The miracle of the feeding of the five thousand, which took place before the confession, as we have called it, recorded by St. John, is said to have been wrought about the time of the Pasch. This would be the third Pasch, a year before the Passion. There is nothing absolutely certain from which we can gather the interval between this miracle and the confession of St. Peter, properly so called, near Cæsarea Philippi, but it seems hardly likely that more than a few weeks intervened, especially as the faith of St. Peter was already, as it appears, ripe at the earlier date. We have thus a period of between seven and eleven months from the formal confession of our Lord's Divinity to the entrance into Jerusalem on the day of Palms, and the longer period seems to be more probable than the shorter. It may be considered certain that whatever is placed by any of the Evangelists between these two points, really took place in the interval, and not in any other period of our Lord's teaching.

When we turn to the several Evangelists, and compare them as to the incidents and doctrine which they have included within the limits of which we have been speaking, we are at once struck with the difference between St. Matthew and St. Mark on the one hand, and St. Luke and St. John on the other, as to the amount of matter which is allotted to this period. St. Matthew and St. Mark, as usual, keep very much to the same topics, save that the latter, also as usual, omits parables and formal teaching and adds here and there lines to the picture which bespeak the close observation of St. Peter's loving eye. St. Luke and St. John are both more copious than either of the former Evangelists, and, as St. John does not repeat St. Luke, but gives a set of discourses and incidents entirely his own, the two together contribute very large additions to our knowledge of the events of this time. St. Matthew's account of the interval of which we speak is contained in four chapters and a half, St. Mark's in two chapters and a small part of a third,

St. Luke's in nearly ten, and St. John's in six. Thus the new matter added by St. Luke and St. John, when put together, would make a Gospel of itself quite as long as that of St. Mark, and more than half as long as that of St. Matthew. Yet it is obvious, at least to those who take the only view of the authorship of the several Gospels which, all things considered, is compatible either with common sense or Christian history—the view that they were written by the authors whose names they bear—that the two first Evangelists cannot have been ignorant of the incidents of that large portion of our Lord's Life which they are thus found to have omitted in their narratives. If St. Matthew and St. Peter, who guided the hand of St. Mark, can be supposed to have been ignorant of any part of the Public Life of our Lord, that part would certainly not be in the last year, when they had long before been admitted to their peculiar intimacy with Him as His Apostles and almost inseparable companions. We have here, therefore, another proof that it cannot have been the object of the writers of the two first Gospels, nor indeed, of any of the Gospels, to tell all that they knew about our Lord's Life, but only all that they had reason to tell for the purpose for which they were commissioned to write. It is impossible, for instance, to suppose that any of the Apostles can have been ignorant of so very conspicuous and important an event as the raising of Lazarus from the dead; or again, as the cure of the man who was blind from his birth. It is equally incredible that they should not have been aware of the washing of the feet of His disciples by our Lord at the Last Supper; or, of the delivery of such parables as that of the Prodigal Son, or the Good Samaritan. All these, however, are omitted by St. Matthew and St. Mark, and supplied by St. Luke or St. John. The omission can be reasonably understood on no hypothesis so well as on that that has been already mentioned—namely, that the earlier Evangelists were guided in their selections of matter for the works which they were compiling by some principle which did not make it necessary for them to insert these particular incidents or parables. If, on the other hand, their object had been that of simple historians, it would have been inevitable for them to extend their works to a length far beyond that which they now attain.

That the interval between the two points of time of which we are now speaking was not a period of inactivity or unfruitful-

ness on the part of our Blessed Lord, is evident from the large space which is occupied by incidents which belong to that interval in the last two Gospels. With regard to St. Luke, the general remark may here suffice, that there are two characteristic features in the ten chapters of his Gospel which are devoted to this period, which may have had something to do with the omission of the details affected by these features on the part of St. Matthew and St. Mark. These two features are first, that the scene of the actions and teaching of our Lord, which are here specially recorded by St. Luke, is almost universally the country of Judæa, properly so called, as distinguished from Samaria and Galilee, and, in the second place, that a considerable number of the incidents are such as have already occurred in the earlier teaching of our Lord in Galilee itself. The entire silence of St. Matthew as to anything which occurs out of Galilee or Peræa until he brings our Lord to Jerusalem on Palm Sunday is very remarkable, and in this respect St. Mark follows him closely. If St. Luke's Gospel then gives us what may be more particularly called the Judæan teaching of our Lord, the Gospel of St. John gives us most especially the very centre of that teaching, as we may term it, that is, the teaching of our Lord at Jerusalem itself. It would perhaps be more proper to speak of this part of our Lord's Ministry as His disputations with the Priests and Scribes at Jerusalem, rather than as direct teaching. A glance at the series of the chapters in St. John to which we refer, will show the reader the truth of this remark. From the seventh to the twelfth chapter of his Gospel, St. John is entirely occupied with these disputations, save only that he interrupts them, if such a word can be used, by the narrative of the raising of Lazarus, which has an immediate connection with the determination of the "Jews"—by which name St. John designates the authorities at Jerusalem—to put our Lord to death. This narrative, therefore, is necessary to bring the hostility which had always broken out at the close of our Lord's disputations, to its full climax in the plot against His life, and it can thus be hardly considered as an exception to the general statement already made as to the manner in which St. John confines himself in this part of his Gospel to what took place at Jerusalem itself.

It would not be at all unreasonable to suppose that St. Matthew and St. Mark who follows him so faithfully and yet with so much of independence, had some special reason, con-

nected with the circumstances of the first Christian Church at Jerusalem, for silence as to all that took place under the eyes of so many who must have been among the hearers of the Apostolical instructions as to our Lord's character and teaching which seem to have formed the foundation of the original Gospel. It is easy to imagine that there may have been reasons for putting before them as the occasion of such instructions rather what had passed elsewhere. We cannot, however, be certain that any such principle of exclusion guided the hands of the earliest Evangelists, or consciously ruled and influenced the selection made by the Apostles themselves of the "anecdotes" of our Lord which they would put before their catechumens. It is at least as easy to account for St. Matthew's silence as to the Judæan teaching and its incidents, as well as the disputations of our Lord with the Jews before the Day of Palms, by the simple consideration of the didactic bearing and character of almost every verse in the chapters which we have to analyze, which refer to the interval between the Confession of St. Peter and the beginning of the Holy Week. We have but to remember that the Gospel was compiled for the purposes of instruction and not of history, and it thus becomes evident that St. Matthew, while following the line of history so far as not to invert the order of any event, is guided by an obvious desire to put forward certain special heads of doctrine which our Lord delivered at this time, mainly to His disciples, and that we should perhaps have had to look in vain for the same doctrine, so fully developed in the teaching of our Lord, either in the synagogues of Judæa or in the courts of the Temple of Jerusalem. What these heads of doctrine are will become more evident as we follow the Evangelist through the several chapters of the Gospel which now lie before us, from the latter verses of the sixteenth to the end of the twentieth chapters.

II.

We have already pointed out that the preaching of the doctrine of the Cross is the first immediate sequel of the Confession of St. Peter and of our Lord's promise to him in return. "From that time," says St. Matthew,¹ "Jesus began to show to His disciples that He must go up to Jerusalem, and suffer many things from the elders and Chief Priests and Scribes, and be

¹ xvi. 21.

put to death, and the third day be raised again." This is immediately followed by the remonstrance of St. Peter with our Lord, and the stern rebuke with which it was met. We are told that this led immediately to the declaration of our Lord, which St. Matthew tells us was addressed to His disciples, whom He called to Him, St. Mark adding that the multitude was also addressed at the same time, and St. Luke saying that He spoke to all. This declaration spoke in the strongest terms of the necessity of "taking up the cross," and following Him. The passage which follows speaks of losing life in order to save it, of the incalculable value of the soul, for which nothing can be given in exchange, and for the loss of which nothing can compensate. St. Mark and St. Luke expand somewhat, or rather add some other words of our Lord to, what St. Matthew has recorded of the coming of the Son of Man in the glory of His Father with the angels to render to every one according to his deeds, and these words again lead us naturally to the promise that there are some there who are not to see death until they have seen the Son of Man come in His glory. A week after this the promise is fulfilled in the great mystery of the Transfiguration, in which the three chosen Apostles were allowed to behold the Sacred Humanity of our Lord in all the glory which was due to it. We need not dwell on the details of this wonderful scene, nor is this the place to point out its connection with the Passion, or its position at the outset of what must certainly be considered a new stage in our Lord's public preaching. St. Matthew's account is, as usual, concise, both of the mystery itself, which he did not witness, and of the miracle on the demoniac boy which took place when our Lord and the three disciples came down from the mountain. After this, some short time seems to have been spent in the country parts of Galilee; probably some kind of "circuit" was made on the way back to Capharnaum from the north-eastern extremities of the Holy Land. At this time we are told by the Evangelists that our Lord again warned the disciples most clearly and particularly as to His approaching Passion, and that they were exceedingly saddened by it. All these circumstances belong to the natural onward course of the history of our Lord after the Confession of St. Peter, and are accordingly related by the first three Evangelists.

Towards the end of his seventeenth chapter, however, St. Matthew proceeds, so to speak, by himself, and we have

from him the account of the application made to St. Peter by the collectors of the Temple revenue as to the didrachma. It would appear from St. Mark's account that St. Matthew, in his characteristic eagerness to get to the point of the instruction which he wishes to introduce, has omitted some circumstances which enable us to understand better the connection of this incident with the chapter which immediately follows it in the Gospel. The order of St. Matthew places immediately after the incident of the didrachma the question of the disciples to our Lord as to the greater in the kingdom of heaven, which our Lord answered by taking a young child and putting him in the midst of them. We learn from the other Evangelists that there had before been a discussion between the Apostles themselves on this same point, which may have been occasioned by the manner in which St. Peter had been associated by our Lord with Himself in the directions which He gave about the paying of the didrachma, especially as a little time had elapsed since the memorable promise made to him alone after his Confession. St. Matthew's order seems to connect the answer as to the didrachma with our Lord's action as to the little child whom He set in the midst of them without any interpretation of the conversation which may have taken place while St. Peter was absent for the purpose which our Lord had committed to him. At all events, we have a series of instructions, as it may almost be called, springing out of the question of the Apostles, and filling the whole of the eighteenth chapter, which closes the account given by St. Matthew of the preaching of our Lord in Galilee. Then instructions are addressed to the disciples in private. They treat of the necessity of humility to enter the kingdom of heaven, of the grievousness of scandal, of the importance and dignity of little ones in the eyes of God, of the duty of forgiveness, and of fraternal correction, of the authority of the Church and the power of united prayer made in the name of our Lord. Then comes the question of St. Peter, how often he is to forgive his brother, which introduces the great parable of the Unmerciful Servant, ending by the threat of the vengeance of the Father on those who do not from their heart forgive the trespasses of their brother.

Instructions such as these have been called by some holy writers the laws of the new kingdom. They regulate the relations of the citizens of that kingdom among themselves, and in many points they are above the level of the Command-

ments, which are obligatory under pain of sin. We find the same strain of teaching continued in the remainder of that part of St. Matthew's Gospel which now lies before us. This teaching is especially addressed to our Lord's own disciples, although occasion is taken, as in the instances of the rich young man or of the question of the Pharisees about divorce, from the cavils or difficulties of others, to introduce the doctrine of the Christian kingdom. If we follow on the narrative in these chapters we find one point after another thus presented to us. The nineteenth chapter opens with the question of the Pharisees "tempting" our Lord, after He had passed out of Galilee into the region of Peræa. The question related to divorce, as to which there were naturally different opinions among the Jews in consequence of the state in which the subject had been left by Moses, and of the continual tendency of the lower passions in human nature to enlarge upon every indulgence which had in any form been once tolerated. This question gave our Lord the opportunity to affirm the Divine Law as to marriage in accordance with the original institution of which God had been the author in Paradise, and it is easy to see at a glance how important this declaration and enactment of our Lord must have been to the first Christian teachers, for whom, in a more special sense, we suppose this Gospel to have been written. Our Lord, in His answer to the Pharisees, speaks with the utmost authority, for He practically revokes the concession made by Moses, or rather He annuls, for the future and for the Christian Church, the licence tolerated by Moses. This gives rise to a further question on the part of the disciples themselves, as to marriage and celibacy, and upon this our Lord utters the memorable words which have had such large and wide influence upon Christian life, about those who have made themselves eunuchs for the kingdom of heaven's sake.

This great declaration of our Lord as to marriage, divorce, and the Evangelical counsel of chastity, is followed in the Gospels both of St. Matthew and St. Mark by the beautiful incident of the children who were brought to Him to be blessed, and whom the disciples endeavoured to hinder on the ground, as it seems, of the trouble which it involved for Him. It is quite possible that the anecdote is in its right place chronologically where the two first Evangelists have placed it. It appears that the question about divorce had been put to our Lord on His arrival in Peræa, and from the manner in which

His journey to that part of the country is spoken of, it may be reasonably inferred that this was the first occasion on which He had preached there for any length of time together. If such were the case, it would be natural that the mothers should bring their children to Him to gain His blessing. It is, however, remarkable that St. Luke, who omits all direct mention of this sojourn in Peræa, passes to the incident of the children from the parable, or anecdote, of the Pharisee and the Publican, as if he saw in it a practical lesson of humility much of the same import as that of the anecdote which he has omitted, when our Lord took a young child and set him in the midst of the Apostles at the time when there had been a dispute among them, who should be the greater. This intention of St. Luke may perhaps throw light upon the place of the anecdote as to the blessing of the children in the other two Evangelists, and may explain why St. Matthew, who is here obviously bent upon selecting what may bear upon the doctrine of what are called the Evangelical Counsels, places this incident between the teaching of our Lord as to chastity after the question of divorce, and His teaching on another of the great Counsels, that of poverty, the occasion of which was the question of the rich young man who came to ask Him first what he must do to have eternal life and then what he must do to be perfect. For the humility of a child may be considered as consisting especially in its detachment from earthly things and possessions, its entire dependence upon others, its ready obedience, its meekness, and its ignorance of sensual passions, and these are the qualities which, when expanded and elevated into Christian virtues, are either the parents or the safeguards of the two great practices of perfection which are recommended by the Counsels of Chastity and Poverty.

St. Matthew, who is here followed by both St. Mark and St. Luke, proceeds from the incident of the blessing of the children to the anecdote already referred to, of the rich young man who put the famous question to our Lord as to perfection, whom our Lord is said to have "loved," and whom He invited to the high vocation of a place in His own immediate company, on condition of his selling all that he had and giving it to the poor, promising him treasure in heaven, and calling him to follow Him. We need not now dwell upon the treasures of doctrine which are contained in our Lord's actions and words with reference to this incident, which would require a commen-

tary of considerable length. It is enough here to point out that the whole of what St. Matthew inserts in his Gospel, to the middle of the twentieth chapter, hangs together and depends upon this incident, which is thus made the occasion for the introduction of more than one of the most distinctively Evangelical heads of teaching. The words of our Lord about the difficulty of the rich entering the kingdom of heaven, a difficulty which he compares to that of the camel and the eye of a needle, were the direct occasion of the question of St. Peter, "Behold we have left all things, and followed Thee, what then shall we have?" Our Lord answers this question, which is, in truth, a twofold question, under two heads. First, He gives the reward of the Apostles who have followed Him, that in the regeneration they are to sit on twelve thrones, judging or ruling the twelve tribes of Israel. Then He gives the reward which belongs to others also, as well as to the Apostles, that every one who has left home, or brethren, or sisters, or father, or mother, or wife, or children, or lands for His sake, shall receive a hundredfold, and be put in possession of, or inherit, eternal life.

In these words we have both the Counsel of voluntary Poverty for the sake of our Lord, and the reward which is promised to such poverty in this life and in the next. As the question of St. Peter referred to those who had become actually poor for our Lord's sake, and not only to the poor in spirit, we must conclude that this promise is made to the former rather than to the latter, although the rule must always be observed of interpreting one saying of our Lord by others, and it must be clear at least that actual poverty, if unaccompanied by poverty of spirit, will not gain the crown which is here held out. If the promise is meant to apply to those who have become actually poor, an interpretation confirmed, if any confirmation is needed, by the history of the rich young man, who could not rise to the height of actual poverty on account of his want of poverty of spirit—then it would appear natural that still further instruction should be added, lest it might be supposed that a particular external vocation in the Church was the unfailing passport to the highest state in the next world. This inference is barred by our Lord by the clause with which His declaration as to the reward itself ends—"But many first shall be last, and last first." And this clause is immediately illustrated, in St. Matthew's Gospel, by the famous Parable of the Labourers in the Vineyard, which concludes by a repetition of the clause itself—"So

shall last be first and first last. For many are called, but few chosen."

The full explanation of this parable cannot be attempted here,² but its teaching is clearly intended to show the royal liberty as well as the royal magnificence with which God bestows His graces and the crowns which correspond thereto. The labourers who went into the vineyard at the eleventh hour had never rejected any previous call, for "no man had hired them," and the lord of the vineyard was free to give them of his bounty what the others had duly laboured for. We are never to make a comparison between the external graces which God has given to others and those which He has given to ourselves—except, indeed, to thank Him for His goodness, as the labourers of the eleventh hour may have thanked the master of the vineyard. For we have no rights before God, except such as are involved in the relation which subsists between Him and us as Creator and creatures, which implies His absolute mastery and lordship over us, as well as the certainty that He will deal with the works of His hands, which He has made out of pure bounty and mercy, according to the ineffable love and holiness which belong to His nature. All gifts are from Him, from the gift of bare existence up to the highest treasures of nature and grace which His kingdom contains, and it is the law of that kingdom that those treasures should be distributed, not according to any right or claim on the part of those who receive them gratuitously, but according to the pleasure of His own goodwill. There are other strains of teaching in this wonderful parable, in which it resembles in some measure that of the Unmerciful Servant and that of the Wedding Garment, but that which has been mentioned may be considered as its principal import, which has given it its particular place in the teaching of our Lord about the Evangelical Counsels, and in this part of St. Matthew's Gospel.

There remain two or three sections of the twentieth chapter to be explained before we can sum up our account of the portion of the Gospel on which we are now engaged. First of all the third instance, recorded by the Evangelist, of our Lord's solemn warning to the Apostles as to His approaching Passion. "He took them to Himself secretly," St. Matthew tells us, and this warning is remarkable for the minuteness with

² The reader may be referred to the *Theology of the Parables*, pp. 40, 41 (Burns and Oates).

which He dwells on the details of His sufferings, His betrayal to the Chief Priests, His condemnation to death, His delivery to the Gentiles to be mocked and scourged and crucified. Our Lord also added on this, as on the other occasions, the prophecy of His Resurrection on the third day. This is immediately followed by the petition of the sons of Zebedee, St. James and St. John, made through their mother, that they might sit on His right hand and left hand in His kingdom. This our Lord answers, first by asking them whether they can drink of the chalice which He is to drink of, and be baptized with the baptism wherewith He is to be baptized; and secondly by declaring that the assignment of the first seats in the kingdom is not His to give, but only to those for whom it is prepared by the Father, Whose Providence has arranged the whole economy of the Kingdom of the Incarnation, Who keeps the times and seasons in His own power, and Who has not revealed the Day of Judgment, even to the angels in heaven. The indignation which this application of the two brothers aroused in the minds of the rest of the twelve gave our Lord an opportunity of speaking to them all as to the true character of all rule and superiority in the Church, inasmuch as the Son of Man Himself came not to be ministered unto, but to minister, and to give His life a ransom for many. The part of the Gospel on which we are dwelling closes with the anecdote of the cure of the two blind men at Jericho as our Lord was passing through that city on His last progress to Jerusalem.

III.

Having thus run through the subject-matter of the chapters of St. Matthew on which we are now commenting, we may briefly gather up the instruction as to the intention of the Evangelist which results from the consideration of that subject-matter. There is in almost every particular an obvious subordination of facts to doctrine; that is, the incidents that are selected lead to instructions or parables delivered by our Lord for the sake of which the incidents seem to be introduced. The exceptions to the general rule are that the great mystery of the Transfiguration, and a few other incidents of minor importance, appear to be related simply on account of their place in the historical order. Again, there is a characteristic family likeness, if we may so speak, among the topics of instruction which

belong in general to what are called by spiritual writers the Evangelical Counsels. The Sermon on the Mount and these chapters in St. Matthew's Gospel, taken together, embrace the whole field of these counsels as they are usually enumerated. We have in these chapters the doctrine, we might rather say the legislation, of our Lord, on the subject of voluntary poverty, chastity, and obedience; on the counsel of giving all things to the poor, of avoiding the occasions of sin, and of fraternal correction. The Sermon on the Mount has already furnished us with the counsels of the love of enemies, the heroic meekness which turns the other cheek to the smiter of one, of rectitude of intention, of simplicity in speech, of conformity between teaching and practice, and of the avoidance of all solicitude for the things of this world. These subjects make up the list, as we have said, of the Counsels, and we thus find that St. Matthew has provided us, in this part of his Gospel, with all that belongs to this field of instruction which has found no place in the Sermon on the Mount.

We come to very much the same conclusion in another way if, following Salmeron and other writers, we consider these chapters as containing, as has been said, our Lord's legislation for the Kingdom which He was about to found, as to certain points in which it was to have a character of its own. Thus the incident at the beginning of the eighteenth chapter, of the child set in the midst of the Apostles, contains the rule that the kingdom must be entered by humility. A little later on we have the severe denunciation of scandal, and then the institution and rules of fraternal correction. Then comes the precept of mutual forgiveness, confirmed by the Parable of the Unmerciful Servant. This is followed by the law of conjugal faithfulness and chastity, and this by those of virginal continence and Evangelical poverty, and the declaration of its reward, while, according to these writers, the Parable of the Labourers in the Vineyard is intended to show that the poor are the best fitted for work in the Vineyard of God. The paragraphs which follow the last announcement of the future Passion, and which relate the petition of the sons of Zebedee, and what ensued therefrom, convey our Lord's laws against ambition and His precept of peace and unity, while the anecdote of the blind men at Jericho inculcates the power of prayer in all that relates to His Kingdom.

Some at least of these considerations may seem to be far-

fetched; but there can be but little doubt as to the general character of the teaching which is recorded in this part of St. Matthew. It is exactly the distinctively Christian teaching, the instruction which comes direct from the Heart of our Lord, and which was the reflection of His own character, which the first teachers of the Christian Kingdom would wish to inculcate upon the faithful under their charge after the first foundations of the system had been well received. It is natural that the sayings of our Lord on which such teaching could be founded should have been, as a general rule, though not perhaps universally, such as occurred in the later period of His teaching in Galilee, or in conversations more directly addressed to His disciples than to the multitudes, than elsewhere. There are, as has been hinted, two large collections of our Lord's sayings which belong to the same period of His Public Life which St. Matthew has passed over, and which, if He were seeking for instructions such as those of which we have been speaking, it was inevitable and necessary that he should pass over. These are to be found in the series of teaching and parables which St. Luke has recorded from his twelfth to his eighteenth chapter, and in the very different series of disputations with the Jews which St. John has inserted in his Gospel from the seventh to the end of the eleventh chapter. In the first of these two instances St. Luke is almost exclusively occupied with what may be called a second beginning of our Lord's public preaching, when, late in the course of the three years of His Ministry, after the Confession of St. Peter and after the Transfiguration, He went for the first time to preach through the cities and villages of Judæa properly so called. In the second instance our Lord is represented by St. John as occupied in refuting the cavils, and bearing the hostility, of the authorities at Jerusalem. But in neither series, either in that of St. Luke or that of St. John, can we find the subject-matter of such teaching as that which St. Matthew has collected in the chapters before us. St. John is dogmatic and controversial, St. Luke is evidently substituting the Judæan teaching as a whole for the Galilæan teaching as a whole, as recorded in the earlier halves of the two first Gospels, and he leads his readers up to the doctrine of the Counsels as given in Peræa, when in his eighteenth chapter he joins St. Matthew and St. Mark in giving the history of the rich young man and our Lord's promise to those who have left all things to follow Him.

If these remarks are true, we can have no hesitation in considering that this part of St. Matthew's Gospel is framed on the same principle as the former parts of which we have already spoken. The line of historical events is kept in sight, and is often prominent in the narrative; but otherwise the incidents are selected on account of the teaching with which they are connected. The practical object of instructing the carefully educated flock of the first Christian teachers in the higher Evangelical precepts, such as those of mutual forgiveness, fraternal correction, the renouncement of all personal honour, the diligent avoidance of occasions of faults and of anything that might offend a weak brother or a little one of Christ, is the guiding rule of the narrative. There is hardly any saying of our Lord recorded in the first Gospel, of which we do not find the echo and the practical issue in the exhortations of the Apostles in their Epistles. Those exhortations must have had their foundation in the sayings of our Lord, and we find these sayings collected, we might almost say, arranged, in these chapters of St. Matthew. They seem to have been written as directly for the use of Evangelical teachers as the chapters themselves which contain the record of the Sermon on the Mount, or as that which gives us the chain of our Lord's Parables.

H. J. C.

Some Notes in Greece.

WE intimated in our last number that we might return, at some future time, to M. d'Ideville's "experiences" in Greece, and his notes are so full of good things that we feel sure they will be read with pleasure. It is always well, also, to enlarge our appreciation of the value of certain current formulas of the day; such as "nationalities," "solidarity of races," and the like, together with the worth of popular self-government for all nations.

The number and value of cultivated French travellers is wonderfully increased, and such writers as M. d'Ideville, M. Beulé, M. Laugel, and others, show the development in that great nation of the sense of natural local, detail and colouring, in which the French memoirs and narratives of a former day are so singularly wanting. Nevertheless, the disease of Paris-sickness still clings to them to a surprising degree; and as of old the Roman citizen declared that out of Rome life was a living death, so the genuine Frenchman still clings to the dear delights of Paris as the only form of life that is worth the name. It was announced to M. d'Ideville by a friend on the Boulevards that his papers were made out as first secretary to the French Minister, then M. Gobineau, at Athens, and after a shower of compliments and congratulations, the friend was much surprised to find both them and his news but coolly received. However, there was nothing for it but resignation (we affect no pun) even to quitting Paris, if he intended to persist in what he calls his "thankless career." He bowed his head, therefore, and accepted the post. It seems a pity that it could not have been bestowed upon some such fervid "Grecian"—if such Frenchmen there be—as Mr. Symonds; for the idea of a prolonged stay in Athens, with all expenses paid, and something of a margin over and above, would certainly commend itself to many men with a fair amount of health and moderate acquirements. But then it does not fall to every

man, as we must admit, to live in a fashionable quarter of Paris.

The newly appointed secretary did, however, make some mild struggle for liberty, though his plans were not carried out with such energy as to succeed. For our own part, we cannot but feel grateful to the *contre-temps* which prevented his seeing the Foreign Minister and praying for his release. In the January, therefore, of 1867, M. d'Ideville, with his wife and boy, reluctantly left the centre of civilization, sending their little girl pursue her way to Orleans, whereas they journeyed on to Hélène—why she was not taken with them is not said—to Marseilles.

The voyage was certainly not propitious. Embarking in the bitter cold, even at Marseilles, at half-past five in the morning on board the *Amérique*, where not a single lady besides Madame d'Ideville was found, the sea fog and misty rain wrapped them round, and the sea became violently rough and *houleuse*. Not till the seventh day thereafter did they land at the Piræus, though on beholding the Acropolis of Minerva's city, M. d'Ideville was able to feel some glow of enthusiastic emotion. But, we feel bound to say, if he could so pity his wife and himself for exchanging Paris for Athens, what profound compassion should he not have felt for the bright young Danish King of twenty years, whom he saw, a few days afterwards, in the brilliantly lit Throne-room entirely unattended, in his huge white marble barrack of a palace! Probably, of all the sovereigns of Europe, crowned or discrowned, the young King of Greece, as a King, is the most thoroughly to be pitied.

The Cretan insurrection was then in full fury, and M. d'Ideville must have afforded considerable amusement to his fellow-diplomates by his naïve credulity as to Athenian "latest intelligence" on the subject. Flocks of mendacious little placards, at five farthings a piece, were carried about and unblushingly sold, of which the French secretary bought a notable specimen, relating that the Turkish army had been driven into the sea, and that the independence of Crete was declared. The English and Italian Ministers (Erskine and della Minerva) then thought it well to give him some insight into Athenian veracity, and to assure him, in answer to his indignant surprize, that it was well if the Government had not directly concocted the false intelligence. Yet M. d'Ideville might well have the laugh on his side, when his diplomatic friends expressed their vehement indignation at the Greek

support of the Cretan revolt. The cry of "solidarity of races" had been shouted with sufficient loudness by England and Germany in regard to another peninsula, when the cry had been held valid ground for the overthrow of all titles of possession and ownership, as well as of every principle of political faith and the integrity of treaties. The Greeks had seen too many Englishmen taking arms under a self-elected marauding chief to sustain the "solidarity" of the Italian races, not to feel justified in their openly expressed indignation that England should uphold the dependence of Greeks in Crete to masters, compared with whose rule the most stringent Government of Austria and Naples was mild and merciful.

At times—we too feel it an absolute refreshment—M. d'Ideville shook himself clear of official gossip and Athenian falsehoods and falsehood-mongers, and escaped to the Acropolis to banish all thought of the wretched Greece of the present in the glories of her past. The reading and scholarship of the amiable Frenchman were probably of a somewhat slender kind, and his taste for associative beauty was perhaps also small, but even he was stirred to some enthusiasm when clambering the huge steps of the Propylæa and the postrate marble blocks of the Parthenon. Poor indeed must be the mind of the spectator who when gazing on the storied plain of Marathon, on Salamis, and the Piræus, looking down upon the stone seats of the Areopagus, and peopling both the azure "many-wrinkled" sea and the thymy hills with the actors of the past, can quarrel with those perfumed hills for being bare, and the town for insufficiency of streets. As in Rome we feel that brand-new Treasuries and stucco Post-offices are impertinently misplaced, and could almost desire that railways were not, so in Athens we should naturally feel that the past ought to swallow up the present, and that the city of Pericles should remain the city of ruins still.

As it was necessary to make some sort of home for his wife and child, M. d'Ideville was of course constrained not wholly to live in the splendid past, but to take a modern house and share the lot of ordinary mortals, even at Athens. He imported a moderate share of pictures and pretty things from Paris, covered his floors with eastern carpets, and resolved to make the best of his stay. To his surprise, when his rooms had been thoroughly arranged, he came in one day to find a man in shirt-sleeves mounted on a step-ladder in his wife's room taking

down the pictures and nails that had so carefully been put up. In answer to his surprized inquires, the man replied that he was the landlord, and he objected to have his walls ruined with nails! M. d'Ideville then bade him begone with his step-ladder, for as he had taken the house it was his property for the time. The landlord, much aggrieved at his peremptory tone, piteously replied, "If you knew that I was an officer of rank of the Legion of Honour, you would not speak to me in this way!" And to his astonishment, he went on to show that he had once been Minister of Justice, President of the Council, with ever so many grand offices besides, and it turned out that he was M. Rhally, who was great in Athens under King Otho's sway.

The next occurrence was by no means of so pleasant or laughable a kind. Two Turkish frigates entered the Piræus, laden with a number of wretched, starved Greek volunteers for Crete, who when there had given themselves up to the French Consul, and whom the Turks were sending back to Athens instead of making them prisoners of war. Scarcely were these wretched, ragged men landed, than the savage treachery of the Greeks showed itself. The Athenian rabble rushed upon them, cut some of them to pieces, threw others into the sea, and dragging a number of them out of the boats, stabbed them with their knives. The French and Russian sailors flew to the rescue, and shut up a body of the volunteers in the Custom-house; but it was with the greatest difficulty that they were finally rescued and the mob driven back by troops. The whole infamous plot had all been arranged beforehand by the Cretan Committee then organized at Athens, and which for a time seemed either to set the Government at defiance or to act by its secret connivance. The wretched feebleness and treachery of the Athenian Government roused even the Italian Minister, della Minerva, a devoted adherent of the very kindred Italian Government, to singular openness of speech. Comparing the two kingdoms, he said:

"At Athens, as to Rome, you get the same result by absolutely contrary means. We find here too, a weak, venal Government, a powerless police, corruption, brigands at the city gates, absolutely no manufactories, and a population of beggars."

Certainly no more accurate description could be given of the condition of the Italian kingdom at present, and the reply made him by M. d'Ideville is so good, that it must be given entire.

"Stop there!" I replied to Minerva. "As to Catholic Rome, I put the Papacy above all ordinary laws [of society]. So great and indispensable an idea as the Vatican is to mankind, can never be likened to such principles as govern peoples, nationalities, dynasties, races, or empires, for they are born, and die, and spring up again, without in the least disturbing the natural order of things. They all pass away, are used up, or remodelled, without making the slightest change in our one great religious idea [of the Church]."

The vanished English Protectorate over the Ionian or "Seven" Islands, elicited many regrets from the French Secretary. He adds his witness to the multitude as to the earthly paradise which Corfu became under the "Lord High" and his mild administration. He specifies the excellence of the roads, bridges, and buildings, the influx of strangers of all nations, the fertility of the soil, and the value of its products. Then, one morning, as he says, the familiar spirit of "nationalities" entered into the Corfiotes, and stirred them up to remember that they too were Greeks, and should never degrade themselves to become slaves to England. And as England of course withdrew, the "Seven Islands" were struck as by an evil fairy's wand. As there was no longer the slightest confidence or security to property, commerce, enterprise, and industry withered up and vanished with English protection. The influx of strangers ceased, the great hotels were empty, the pretty houses were deserted, the beautiful bridges and roads fell out of repair, and the single counterbalancing advantage of paying taxes to Athens and of being subject only to Greeks, did not prevent the Corfiote deputy from exclaiming aloud in the Athenian Parliament, "Cursed be the day when we asked to be annexed to the kingdom of Greece!"

It is not only in the Seven Islands that commerce and industry have perished. The men whose ports of old were crowded with vessels from all the countries of the known world, and whose trade was fed by the most ingenious industries and manufactories, now seem only capable of blighting every form of industry that springs up upon their soil. A French and English company was started at Athens for silk and cotton works which promised great success. Numbers of people were employed, and were learning habits of labour and application over and above their useful trade, when there sprang up the usual crop of Greek suspicions and jealousies. Strangers were growing rich at the expense of the Athenians—the Athenians

were gulled, robbed, and betrayed. The workmen were ordered, by a combination of patriots, to strike for an increase of wages, and though always liberal, the increase was given, and the works again went forward. Then a fresh demand was made for still larger wages, and this the directors of the works refused, and imported foreign workmen, which still enabled them to keep their factories going. The ingenuity of the Athenian "patriots"—following the worst of their ancient traditions—then conceived the idea of forbidding any one to work in the foreign factories under pain of death. The furnaces, therefore, were finally extinguished, and the gaunt empty buildings and grass-grown courts now bear eloquent witness that the modern Athenians love their country both wisely and well.

An enterprising and exceedingly intelligent gentleman of Marseilles, M. Roux, had also organized a most successful Franco-Italian company for working the old silver mines of Laurium and those at Ergastiliã. He was of course obliged to import workmen—Frenchmen, Englishmen, and Spaniards—with whose assistance he made excellent roads, a railway, built a small port, and quite a little town of buildings and works for the mines. And thus there was seen, even in modern Greece, one small patch of district where industrious and intelligent perseverance was bringing forth its full harvest. This very success soon brought about the speedy death of the whole undertaking. Parliament was besieged and irritated by the continual questions of "patriots" as to how long it would be before these dangerous and insidious foreigners would be sent away, and the industries of Greece reserved for Greeks alone. Every newspaper had its daily article and daily legend as to the ships, heavily laden with Greek silver, which set sail secretly in the night to enrich foreign shores, and in the end these complaints wrought their usual result. The company broke up, the Athenian Parliament legislatively deprived M. Roux of the mines, offering him an indemnity more or less real (in 1873), and whatever amount of silver may now be dug from the old Laurium mines is extracted with patriotic hands.

More wonderful, even, than their total want of application to industry and commerce, is the utter deadness of the modern Athenians to art. M. d'Ideville was told by Professor Lanza (a Venetian), of the Government schools at Athens, that during the four years he had, in 1867, been teaching, he had not met with a single Greek pupil who had the smallest artistic feeling.

He even believed it was a kind of impossibility to them to conceive the comprehension of form in any æsthetic sense ; and that in music, as well as in painting and sculpture, there was a total blank alike of genius, talent, or feeling. Everything built in Athens has been planned and raised by Bavarian strangers. The Athenian youths of all classes, who can realize a little money, fly to Paris, London, or St. Petersburg, and when they return to Greece, instead of bringing with them habits of industry, or any useful tastes in literature or art, they are found to have contracted merely the vilest habits of the corruptest corners of the great centres of civilization. The condition of the country is the more pitiable, because there is nothing cleverer or more apt to learn and to receive impressions than the children and youths of all classes in Greece. Even the little borough and country schools are admirably conducted and taught, and at Megara M. d'Ideville himself saw with pleasure more than a hundred little boys and girls reading authors in ancient Greek with ease. The University courses at Athens are open to every student free, and crowds of scholars of Greek blood, from Asia Minor as well as the peninsula, eagerly avail themselves of the instruction given. A considerable number of these students pass on afterwards to Paris and Germany to study law, medicine, mining, and civil engineering in foreign capitals, but when they return, well furnished with an excellent education, to Athens, there is no career open to them, nothing for them to do.

The consequence is that a vast army of idlers, and very mischievous and dangerous idlers too, hang about the town and swarm on the fashionable promenade of the Patissia road, discussing and criticizing every act of the Government and movement of the King, indulging in the wildest theories of the "Eastern Question," and becoming daily more and more good for nothing, frivolous, mendacious, and utterly unpractical in mind. And in order to prevent possible greater mischief, the Government perpetuates the actual evil by employing these men in some of the countless Government offices, and then pensioning them off with small life pensions for their "services." Thus, with an army of only five thousand men, and a navy of five ships, with an administration, executive, and police which are almost *nil*, and scarcely any outlay at all for public works, the revenue of four and twenty millions¹

Of francs.

has a yearly deficit of some millions. Nor is this to be wondered at, considering that the enormously disproportionate sum of from twelve to fourteen millions is annually spent in pensioning the idle and worthless officials who succeed each other like swarms of locusts in devouring their own country, while adding not a farthing to its resources or a farthing's worth of work to the general good. "To tell the news and hear it, and eat at Easter an excellently well roasted lamb," is the sum total of these "patriots'" toil.

But then, we must respectfully recall, they can talk for any number of hours, or for whole days together, of the "Great Idea," that is, of the neo-Byzantine Empire at Constantinople. M. d'Ideville judiciously points out to his more enthusiastic friend, M. Beulé, that, as it has proved a dangerous and doubtful experiment to try to bind together the many-coloured "nationalities" of Italy, Germany, and the Slaves, so it is even a more fatal and hopeless effort to galvanize the corpse of a dead country, to build up a kingdom of plaster and painted canvas, and to enrol a bird-mawkin among the sovereigns of Europe, merely to throw a sop to the rivalry and selfishness of the great European Powers. He wittily says, soon afterwards, that his most fervent blessing will rest upon the powers of the Quai d'Orsay (the French Downing Street), on the day when they shall despatch him to a country without "aspirations." Certainly the "aspirations" of Greece, especially of the idea of a magnificent neo-Byzantine Empire, contrast drolly enough with a Government which dares not lay down the plaything railway from Athens to the port, voted for many years, lest the hackney coachmen should congregate in riot and overturn "King George and all his men."

It was only at rare intervals that our poor French Secretary, at last adding serious bodily illness to his Paris-sickness and his loathing of Athens, seems to have wisely turned his back upon political and official miseries, and thoroughly explored the ancient haunts of the Greek gods. Considering that the Legation enjoyed a perfect immunity from official work, except on Fridays, it is certainly a pity that he wasted such opportunities, for although it was necessary to carry arms and to take a guard, the neighbourhood of Athens was not then so fatal as it has lately become. There was a short excursion to Mount Pentelicus of the rosy marble, and a dinner at the Greek convent, surrounded with delicious shade and blossoming

oleanders, which should, even without its special associations, have charmed the poor gentleman from his continual strophes of lamentation. And late in April, when the rose and violet sunsets aroused him, though reluctantly, to genuine enthusiasm, M. d'Ideville took a trip to Ægina, which he describes with the heartiness one would like to see elsewhere. Although it is a matter only of three or four hours' sail, he seems to have been a little afraid of the sea, though its perfect calm made him regret that he had not taken his wife and boy with him. The delicious, enchanting colouring of sea and sky, the transporting purity of the crystalline air, the wild, huge rocks and bare crags of the island, the landing at Hagia Marina and the ascent to Minerva's grand old temple, stirred him, as well they might, to the profoundest admiring emotion. Looking afar off could be seen the rocky characteristic coasts of Attica, and the myriad islets strewn like nosegays of bloom and verdure over the azure sea. The Acropolis of Athens and the pure outline of the majestic Parthenon stood out with delicate sharpness against the mountains, and the whole air was full of a silence bright with joy, the humming of bees, and the aromatic fragrance of the carpets of lavender and thyme. Surely any man should be able to offer a fervent thanksgiving for being allowed once in his life to behold that sight, and to lay it up to enjoy for the years to come.

M. d'Ideville, however, became rapidly so much worse that he wrote to France to ask for his recall. He recognized, when it was too late, that he would have done wisely in following M. Beulé's counsel, and made continual expeditions to the islands and in the peninsula ; but, as those picturesque outlines and blossoming isles vanished from his sight, he could not refrain from the hope that he should never behold them again.

There are certain facts mentioned by M. d'Ideville in his pleasant, chatty notes, which, even if we entertained them, would utterly destroy all our hopes of even moderately great or greater things for Greece. For instance, the wretched mockery of the Athenian House of Parliament, with its dirty flags, its dirtier red calico platforms, and its dirtiest members, lying about upon the benches smoking, or springing up to scream and gesticulate, like a set of *fantoccini* galvanized to insanity, and after some fustianly-eloquent speech, wiping their noses with their fingers.

Still more pitiful, for of infinitely graver moment, is the utter indifference and deadness to real religion, or its vital practice, at Athens; and here we see in the fullest light of day the mournful state to which a dead, ceremonial belief, with no inner life, can reduce a people. "The Greek Easter is all roast lamb and fireworks," says M. d'Ideville; and that his words are no exaggeration, is confirmed by his own observations in another place. Good Friday is celebrated at Athens with picturesque processions, when the Sacred Host is borne with lighted tapers through the streets, while salvos and fireworks are let off in every direction. During the afternoon M. d'Ideville went into one of the houses, where a group of gentleman were playing at cards, drinking wine and smoking between whiles. One of these men presently got up, and said to the rest, "Come, we must not forget to go to Communion," and they all left their cards and their wine, and went off to the Church to fulfil the Paschal rite. With such an amount and kind of inner religious life, we are not able to entertain hopes of great things for Greece, or even for any brand-new Byzantine Empire.

"Tout est dit."

(LA BRUYÈRE.)

MAY thought no more with wit aspire
New language to the soul to give?
Nor genius more to words yield fire
Their fleeting utt'rance to outlive?
While man to man a hope imparts,
While echoes wake in human hearts
Shall language ever weave a spell
Responsive to the springs that dwell
Where searching glance ne'er yet could steal?
Oh! plead not then that words no more
May take new impress from the mind.
What genius breathed in days of yore
Is but a treasure that we find
Bequeathed by thought of other days,
Still sparkling with its mellowed rays
Tho' chilled by eld and hoared with rime,
Memento of a bygone time,
Stray vestige of its woe or weal.

W. CHARLES BRYANT.

St. Jerome and his Correspondence.

PART THE FOURTH.

IN its yearly recurring commemoration of the virtues and services of St. Jerome, the Roman Church lays special stress on his unrivalled excellency as a teacher and expounder of the Divine Scriptures.¹ As is meet, this solemn record of his all but life-long toil, of his self-denying studies which have shed so much light on the obscurities of the inspired text, and revealed the treasures of wisdom and of the knowledge of God stored within it, take the form of humble thanksgiving to Him "from whom every best gift, every perfect gift descends," reminding us at the same time of the Providential character attaching to the mental labours of which the Latin Vulgate is the issue. As we have more than once observed, it was in Rome, that he received the impulse that started him on the career which Divine Providence had marked out for him. In Rome he began his active Biblical labours, which date from the time when St. Damasus had secured his services for that Church. In the affectionate familiarity of domestic and epistolary intercourse, this Holy Pontiff, with that tact and insight into character and capabilities of which the annals of the Papacy afford so many illustrious instances, gauged the vast depths of St. Jerome's mind; by the gentle compulsion of his well-timed importunity² he induced him to undertake a work for which the bent of his mind, the direction which his previous studies had taken, his chastened critical skill, and his power of close concentration so pre-eminently fitted him.

But while claiming for St. Damasus some share in the glory redounding to St. Jerome as the translator of Scripture, we must not forget to call attention to circumstances connected with this portion of his labours, which plainly witness to the action of the

¹ Roman Missal. Collect for Sept. 30.

² *Epist. Damas.* ap. Hieron, t. ii. p. 561.

special Providence ever shielding, sustaining, and guiding the successor of St. Peter in his care of all the Churches.

Little need be added to what has already been said as to the fitness of St. Jerome for this gigantic enterprize. Scaliger,³ asserts that "both on account of his vast learning and of his linguistic acquirements, St. Jerome stands pre-eminent amongst all who have attempted to translate the inspired volumes, and has been surpassed of none, either before or since his days." What is more to our present purpose, is the corruption into which the Latin texts of Scripture, current in the West, had fallen towards the close of the fourth century. The following passage from St. Jerome's dedicatory letter to St. Damasus of the first instalment of his work, may help us to realize the pitch it had attained.

Hardly any two copies are alike. Instead of seeking out the genuine reading by collating a number of them, was it not better to go to the Greek original, and thereby correct the mis-translations of blundering interpreters, the presumptuous emendations of incompetent critics, the amplifications, changes, and mutilations of the text due to the carelessness of copyists?⁴

Damasus, fully alive to the dangers this unsettled state of the sacred text was fraught with to the purity of the faith, conceived the plan of a new version or revision grounded on a careful study of the best Greek texts, to be hereafter adopted by the Churches of the West, in lieu of the discordant copies then in use. But who could be intrusted with such a task? The arrival of St. Jerome enabled him to witness at least the partial realization of his project. The disciple of St. Gregory Nazianzene collated the current versions with the original Greek, and soon put forth a revised edition of the four Gospels, to which he appended six canons, or tables of concordances borrowed from Ammonius of Alexandria and Eusebius of Cæsarea.

The disorder which thus appealed to the pastoral solicitude of Damasus, was pregnant with evils still more to be dreaded in prospect, than at the time. The political separation of the East and West was fast becoming an accomplished fact, and paving the way to the deplorable schism which still divides Christendom. A prophetic instinct, or providential illumination, enabled the Pontiff to forecast the growing dangers of perpetuating false

³ *Vide* G. Carpzovius *Crit. Sacr.* Proœmium, p. 22.

⁴ *Præf. in iv. Evangel. ad. Damasum.*

and conflicting Latin copies of the Scriptures. As we have seen above, St. Jerome first applied himself to the re-establishment of the purity of the Gospel text, which being more frequently transcribed, had naturally suffered most at the hands of careless copyists, who, especially in the three first Gospels, inserted additional details from parallel passages, and did not stick at changing the forms of expression to those with which custom had familiarized them. With that wise conservatism, which, after all, is but another name for common sense, Jerome limited his object to the revision of the old Latin,⁵ carefully collating early Greek copies, and preserving the current rendering wherever the sense was not injured or obscured by it, retrenching the careless interpolations, by which the text of the three first Gospels especially, was disfigured, and thus checking the perpetuation of unauthorized glosses. Far from intending a new version, when St. Augustine congratulated him on his *translation* of the Gospels,⁶ he tacitly disclaims the compliment by substituting in his reply the word *emendation* for *version*.⁷

In the absence of any other prefaces, save that to the four Gospels, a question has been raised whether the revision of St. Jerome extended to the remaining books of the New Testament. The omission here noticed may be probably accounted for by the comparatively pure state of the other books. As may be seen in the Preface to the revised Gospels, Damasus had urged his secretary to revise the whole; nor is it to be believed that after having faced the more invidious and delicate part of his work, and excited the clamours of that always numerous and respectable party, who as he puts it, "confound ignorance with holiness,"⁸ he would have failed to complete what he had begun. Nor are we left to mere surmises. In his letter to Marcella, which we have just quoted, wherein he complains of the charges brought against him for "his rashness in correcting certain passages in the Gospels," he alleges three passages from the Epistles in which he asserts the superiority of the present reading to that of the old Latin.⁹ What is no less directly conclusive as to the fact of this complete revision, is his own express statement in his reply to

⁵ Præfat. ad Damasum.

⁶ Epist. civ. 6.

⁷ Epist. cxii. 20.

⁸ Epist. ad Marcella, xxv. (Circ. A.D. 385).

⁹ Rom. xii. 11, *Domino servientes for, tempori servientes*; 1 Tim. i. 15, *Fidelis sermo, for Humanus sermo*.

Lucinius, a noble Spaniard, who had applied to him for copies of his new version :

I have revised the New Testament in accordance with the Greek text, for as the Hebrew original is the standard by which the books of the Elder Covenant are to be judged, those of the New Testament find their norm in the Greek text.¹⁰

While preparing his revised text of the New Testament, St. Jerome took in hand the Psalter, the manual of prayer and praise for the countless generations of the Israël of God. In this revision, he proceeded by the help of the text of the Septuagint, or Alexandrian Greek version. The words in which he describes this portion of his labours, lead us to believe that it was not very complete, or carefully performed—

While at Rome I revised the Psalter, correcting it by the text of the LXX. for the most part, though in a cursory manner.¹¹

This recension is commonly known as the *Roman Psalter*, probably on account of its having been made at the request of St. Damasus for the use of the Church of Rome, where it was retained until the pontificate of St. Pius the Fifth, who, in 1566, introduced into the public Office a later recension made by St. Jerome, known as the *Gallican Psalter*. The ancient, or *Roman Psalter*, is, however, still retained by the Chapters of St. Peter's, of Milan Cathedral, and of St. Mark's at Venice. The exact date of this second revision, with which the Breviary has familiarized us, cannot be fixed. We can only affirm that the Roman Psalter failed to displace the elder version, stereotyped as it was, so to speak, in the memory of the people, and consecrated by its use in public and private worship. Moreover, the blunders of careless scribes soon caused "the old error to prevail over the new correction."¹² At the earnest request then of Paula and Eustochium, St. Jerome set about a new and more thorough revision, most probably some time between A.D. 387, the date of his final settlement with Paula and Eustochium at Bethlehem, and 391, when he had begun his new translations from the "Hebrew verity."

His aim in this new version was to represent as far as possible, by the help of the Greek versions, the genuine reading of the original text. With this view he made use of the purest edition of the Alexandrian version, which was to be found in the

¹⁰ *Epist.* lii.

¹¹ *Prefat.* in *Psalter*.

¹² *Prefat.* in *Psalterium*.

Hexapla of Origen preserved in the archives of the Church of Cæsarea, the civil metropolis of Palestine. He likewise copied the notation¹³ of Origen, in order to indicate the several additions and omissions of the LXX. as reproduced in the Latin. This new edition did not fail to meet with a favourable reception. It is commonly held that St. Gregory of Tours introduced it from Rome into Gaul, where it was used in public worship, and thus obtained the name of the *Gallican* Psalter.

This second revision of the Psalms was the first instalment of a new edition of the other books of the Hebrew Canon,¹⁴ which Jerome sought to restore, by the help of the Greek version in its purest form, to a close agreement with the original text. Of this work, in which he spent some four or five years, the Psalter and the revised Latin text of Job, with their respective prefaces, and those to Paralipomena, Proverbs, Ecclesiastes, and Canticles, are alone extant. There is, however, no reason for doubting that St. Jerome completed his task of re-editing all the proto-canonical books of the Old Testament, he himself expressly asserts as much in his letter to St. Augustine (A.D. 404), as also in his already quoted letter to Lucinius, and in his Apology against his virulent ginsayer Rufinus:

Could I have depreciated the LXX. translators, of whose version I gave a corrected edition for the use of students of mine own tongue?¹⁵

His reply to St. Augustine's request to be favoured with a copy of his new work helps us to account for the disappearance of the greater portion of it:

There is in these parts a great scarcity of persons able to copy Latin, so that it was out of my power to comply with your wishes by sending you my edition of the version of the LXX. marked with *obeli* and asterisks, for I have lost the chief part of my former labours by the dishonesty of a certain person.¹⁶

This was not the only complaint St. Jerome had to make in connection with this portion of his Scriptural work, he was annoyed by the attacks of the optimists of the party, which then as now, were unable to see that change might sometimes be synonymous with improvement and progress. In his Preface to Job, he indignantly observes, that no one would have interfered with him had he spent his days, like so many monks,

¹³ *Epist. ad Sun. et Fretel.*

¹⁵ *Apol. adv. Ruf. ii. 24.*

¹⁴ *Epist. lxxiv. ad Augustin.*

¹⁶ *Epist. lxxix. ad Augustin.*

in plaiting rushes, or weaving palm-leaves into mats, but that he was reviled as a forger, because he applied himself to the correction of the Sacred Text. The like complaints, though somewhat toned down, recur in his Preface to Paralipomena.

His success in correcting the old Latin version, the *Vetus Itala* as it is called, encouraged him to undertake his translation of the Hebrew original, which is not the least of his claims to the undying gratitude of all generations of believers. In our description of his terrible conflicts with youthful passions at the period of his first withdrawal from secular life, we have shown that he began the study of Hebrew, in the hope that the difficulties of this language, which had then still some centuries to wait for the vowel-points and its grammar, would serve to subdue the uprisings of the flesh. From this time forth, he continued the study with unabated zeal, and availed himself of every help and of every opportunity of perfecting his knowledge of the language of inspiration. He did not confine himself to the study of books, but entered into close relations with the learned Jews he met in his various travels, in order to submit to them his difficulties and to be enlightened by their knowledge. Acting on the maxim to which Goethe was afterwards to give expression,¹⁷ in order the better to penetrate the sublime utterances of the poets and seers of the chosen race, he travelled over the length and breadth of Palestine and Egypt to ascertain the situation of the several places mentioned in Holy Writ, their names, with the origin and signification thereof. Not the least interesting portion of the long letter, which he addressed to Eustochium on the death of her heroic mother, is that in which he minutely describes the journeys he undertook in the company of Paula to well-nigh every spot that was the theatre of an incident recorded in the pages of inspiration. So too, in after ages, did another valiant champion of the Cross brave every peril to life and freedom to deepen his knowledge and inflame his love of Christ by lingering in rapt contemplation at every place that had been hallowed by His bodily presence. For despite the differences of their characters and of the services each was called to render to the Church, the travels of St. Jerome through the Holy Land remind us of the pilgrimage of St. Ignatius, the penitent of Manresa.

¹⁷ *Der will den Dichter verstanden, &c.* —

“Who would the poet understand
Must travel in the poet’s land.”

It was at Tiberias, on the lake of Genesareth, "hallowed by the navigation of our Lord," that St. Jerome and Paula tarried ere starting for Egypt, the cradle-land of the monastic and cœnobitic life. After the fall of Jerusalem, and the destruction of the Jewish polity by the arms of Titus, the Scribes and doctors of the Law transferred their schools to Tiberias. It was probably in this town that St. Jerome made acquaintance with the celebrated Rabbi Bar-Anina,¹⁸ whose character and learning had won his esteem, and from whom he derived such valuable aid in his favourite studies. His ardour in the pursuit of Biblical lore was cooled neither by difficulty, expense, nor the misrepresentations of his numerous gainsayers, among whom Rufinus invented a wretched pun on the name of Bar-Anina, distorted for the nonce, by reproaching him with undertaking his work without any sanction from ecclesiastical authority, but supported by that of a second Barabbas.¹⁹

Though somewhat thin-skinned, St. Jerome was not to be deterred by sarcasms of this calibre, from pursuing his object. He soon found occasion for his Hebrew. In some of his earliest critical letters (A.D. 381—383) he examines the force of Hebrew words, and was soon after engaged in comparing the version of Aquila, whom he not unfrequently follows very closely in his translation of the Psalms, with several Hebrew codices which a Jew had succeeded in procuring for him from a synagogue."²⁰ No sooner had he settled down at Bethlehem, when he published several works evincing a rare depth of Hebrew erudition, among which were his book on Hebrew names and places and his treatise on the Hebrew Questions concerning Genesis,²¹ a book teeming with references to the Jewish traditions and the esoteric doctrines of the Rabbinical schools. He thus prepared himself for the new version which he took in hand, about A.D. 385, for the purpose, as he tells us,²² of enabling Christians to meet the stock objections of the Jews to the accuracy of their Scriptural quotations.

The new version, unlike his recension of the Gospels, was undertaken not at the promptings of ecclesiastical authority, but at the urgent request of private friends, especially of the Bishop Chromatius, who in his frequent encounters with the Jews, had felt the need of a Latin translation of the Hebrew

¹⁸ *Epist.* xli. *ad Pammach.* et *Ocean*; *In Rufin.* i. ii. *passim*.

¹⁹ *Apol.* i. 13. ²⁰ *Epist.* xxiv. *ad Marcellam*. ²¹ *Questiones Hebraicae in Genesin*.

²² *Præfat.* in *Isai*.

text. The history of this version, of which we subjoin a rapid sketch, is in the main told us in the several Prefaces accompanying the instalments of the work as it was successively published. He began A.D. 385 with the four Books of Kings, to which he affixed his famous *Prologus Galeatus*, addressed to Paula and Eustochium. He speaks of this translation as emphatically his own, on account of the care with which he had executed it. "Begin by reading," says he in the Prologue, "my Books of Samuel²³ and of Kings; yes, mine, for surely we may claim as our own whatever we have impressed on our minds, by careful revision and scrupulous emendation."

To Kings succeeded the Psalms, and many of the Prophets, which latter were in circulation in 393. The Book of Job also was by this time in the hands of his intimate friends, as appears from his letter to Pammachius.²⁴ The celebrated Dutch Orientalist, Albrecht Schultens, in the Preface to his new translation of Job, passes the following *encomium* on this portion of St. Jerome's labours: "Highly as I value the Vulgate version in all its parts, yet am I persuaded that in Job it has reached its highest pitch of excellence, and has scarce, if at all, been surpassed by subsequent translations." The next books he put into circulation were Esdras and Nehemias, which he translated at the repeated requests of Dominica and Rogatianus. The three Books of Solomon, Proverbs, Ecclesiastes, and Canticles, followed in 398, being, as he says in the Preface, the work of three days of his convalescence after a severe illness. This, of course, is to be understood of their final preparation for publication, as it would seem from what we read in his *De Viris Illustribus* (135), that he had already by him, in 392, a translation of most of the Old Testament. There now remained the Octateuch (Genesis to Ruth inclusive), Paralipomena, Esther, Jeremias, and Daniel. Of the Octateuch, the five books of Moses were published first, certainly not earlier than his Apology against Rufinus, A.D. 400. The remaining books, with the exception of Paralipomena, which there are strong reasons for assigning to a somewhat earlier date, were completed in A.D. 404, shortly after Paula's death, at the earnest request of Eustochium. He further translated the deuterocanonical books, as they are sometimes called, of Tobias and Judith. As we learn from his Preface to the latter, he made his translation by a hasty revision of an old Latin version, with the help of a Chaldee copy

²³ 1 and 2 Kings in the Vulgate.

²⁴ *Epist. xxxi. ad Pammach.*

which was translated for him into Hebrew by an assistant, who was acquainted with both dialects. It was the work of a single day. One short effort (*una lucubratiuncula*) sufficed for the version of Judith. Certain observations of his on Esther and Daniel render it most probable that the Latin translation of the additions to these two books, which are wanting in the original text are due to his pen. They are taken from the Greek version of Theodotion. He did not, therefore, translate Baruch, Wisdom, Ecclesiasticus, or the Books of the Maccabees, the old Italic version of which has been retained in our Latin Bibles. His version of the Psalms from the Hebrew, despite its unquestionable excellencies, has likewise failed to displace his first and second recension of the Psalter, the *Psalterium Romanum* and *Gallicanum*, mainly on account of the difficulty and inconvenience of altering the formulæ of public prayer and private devotion, which, till within a very recent period were mostly borrowed from the Psalter. With all his ardour for reform, St. Jerome made due allowance for these circumstances, as appears both from his care to preserve in his recensions the old and familiar forms of expression,²⁵ and from his incidental mention in his reply to the written strictures of Rufinus,²⁶ of the fact of his using the old Psalter in the daily choral service of his retreat at Bethlehem.

Thus, the work, which has immortalized the name of St. Jerome, was completed in A.D. 405. It was the result of serious, persevering studies spread over twenty years, taking interruptions into account. His Prefaces to Ecclesiastes and to the Pentateuch contain an account of the method he followed throughout. Setting aside the authority of all previous versions, he made the Hebrew the groundwork of his translation, keeping, however, the LXX. constantly in view, and adopting in a sober spirit of conservatism, their rendering, rather than that of any other version, wherever its discrepancy from the original was not too marked, lest he should needlessly shock his readers by giving to his translation too great an appearance of novelty. He also consulted Aquila, Symmachus, and Theodotion. In a word, his guiding principle throughout, was to give the sense of the original, without much troubling himself, when that was attained, with niceties of expression; he sometimes added a few words for the purpose of bringing out the sense more clearly; at others, he omitted what he deemed redundant. The

²⁵ *Epist. ad Sun. et Fretel.*

²⁶ *Apologia contra Rufin.* l. ii.

version had no sooner been published, than, as St. Augustine bears witness,²⁷ the Jews gave to it the preference over the Septuagint, which is by no means to be wondered at, and acknowledged its general fidelity and literal accuracy, a more positive testimony to its merits. Indeed, his close and somewhat servile adherence to the original text renders this version at times obscure. As we have seen, parts of it were finished in great haste, for instance, the Books of Solomon, Tobias, and Judith. There are consequently errors and blemishes which a more careful revision might have removed; nor was Jerome blind to these imperfections, as he not unfrequently admits, as preferable, renderings different from those he had adopted in the Vulgate text, and freely acknowledges his occasional blunders.²⁸ Admitting all these drawbacks, they are mere trifles in comparison with the unquestionable excellencies of the work he succeeded in accomplishing. He supplied the Churches of the West with a version from the original, not the mere version of a version, and raised to his memory a monument of philological skill hitherto unsurpassed, if not unrivalled. In less than three centuries, his work, unaided by any direct interference of ecclesiastical authority in its favour, by the sole virtue of its own intrinsic merits, supplanted the *vetus Italia*, the elder Latin version, freed the West from the Septuagintal tradition, and may without exaggerated partiality, be fairly considered the living, abiding link between ancient and modern thought and speech in the highest domain of human speculation. But while thus paying all due honour to the genius and industry of St. Jerome, we must not forget that Paula and Eustochium, names written in the Book of Life, and fitly inscribed on the very frontispiece of the new Vulgate, may claim a share in the glory of his work. The learning, the ardour for Scriptural studies of these two heroic women, their filial devotedness to St. Jerome, helped and encouraged him in his arduous labours, sustained his drooping spirits when smarting under narrow-minded criticism, or disheartened by the persecution, which is but too frequently the lot of those who devote splendid talents to the service of their fellows. But we must give place to St. Jerome, who, in his Epitaph on Paula, already quoted in these pages, thus describes her persistence in seeking to share in his favourite studies.

²⁷ *De Civit. Dei* l. 18. c. 43.

²⁸ *Comment. in XIX. Isai.*

At length she fairly compelled me to lecture to herself and her daughter on the Old and New Testament. I refused for a while, from a feeling of my inability, but was forced to yield to her importunity and reiterated demands that I should allow her to become a partaker of what I had learned, not indeed from myself, or in other words, from my own self-sufficiency, which is the most dangerous of teachers, but from the illustrious Fathers of the Church. When I hesitated as to the meaning of a passage and frankly owned my ignorance, not content with this confession, she compelled me by repeated questions to tell her which of the several explanations was the better grounded.

I will further relate what may seem incredible to the gainsayers of Paula. I know somewhat of Hebrew, having studied it from my youth upwards with great care and application, and still persevering in this study, lest if I forsook it, it should forsake me. Paula too, undertook to learn it, and with such success that she could sing the Psalms in Hebrew, and pronounce it without any foreign accent, an acquirement which, as may be seen, her daughter Eustochium has inherited.²⁹

The final clause of this last quotation enables us to account for the dedication to these ladies of certain portions of the translation, as well as for his frequent appeals before the Church and the world to their witness in its favour. The following passage from his Preface to the new version of Esther, shows him even seeking to shelter his own responsibility under the authority of their well-known linguistic skill.

Knowing as I do, how conversant you are with the Hebrew Scriptures, and how thoroughly you have examined the essays of the former Biblical translators, I beg you, Paula and Eustochium, to take the Hebrew text of Esther, and to compare therewith my new version, line for line, so as to be able to witness that I have nought added or omitted, but that as befits a faithful and honest translator, I have merely turned this Hebrew story as it is in the original, into the Latin tongue.

As we have already had occasion to observe, it was at the pressing request of Paula and Eustochium, that St. Jerome attempted a second recension of the Psalms in place of the former, in which the *vis inertie* of routine, and the ignorance and carelessness of copyists had effaced almost every vestige of his emendations. But not content with stimulating him to exertion, they took an active part therein, by collecting materials, comparing the several versions which had hitherto appeared, affording throughout a studious and intelligent assistance to the labours that produced the Psalter now all but universally adopted by the Latin Churches.

²⁹ Epist. lxxxvi.

It must have been an interesting sight, indicative too, of the mighty transformation which Christianity was bringing about, to behold these two illustrious ladies whose name and lineage recalled the purest glories of Rome's era of freedom and conquest, the lowly disciples of a poor Dalmatian priest, sharing his arduous studies, collating Hebrew rolls, the texts of the several editions of the Septuagint, the Hexapla of Origen, the versions of Symmachus,³⁰ Aquila,³¹ and Theodotion,³² together with the old Latin Vulgate, and copying out that Psalter which supplies us with the formulæ of public prayer and praise. We may now understand how Jerome sought their sympathy in his various trials, and places, so to speak, his works and reputation under their patronage. In his Preface to Kings, he thus expresses his reliance upon them.

Handmaidens of Christ, ever anointing His head with the priceless ointment of faith, I conjure you to protect me from the rage of those dogs who go about the city barking, and whetting their teeth that they may inflict a more grievous wound; from the clamour of these ignorant men who deem themselves learned, when they can depreciate knowledge in others; shield me, I beseech you, with your prayers.

It is foreign to our purpose to pursue the history of the Vulgate of St. Jerome through its several recensions, down to the last of all, which Clement the Eighth stamped with the seal of Apostolic sanction in his Bull of November 9th, A.D. 1592. We conclude by referring to the decree of the holy Council of Trent in its fourth session (8th April, 1546), to which the learned theologian Andrew Vega, who was present at the Council, has appended this comment, in his palmary work on Justification: ³³ "The holy Council declared the Vulgate text authentic in the sense of its unquestioned freedom from any error that might supply grounds for inferences at variance with faith or morals, and hence forbade it to be excepted to on any pretext whatsoever." Grotius, in his *Votum pro Pace*, maintains the same conclusion: "For those who know neither Greek, nor Hebrew, the Vulgate version is the safest, in that it is free from all error in dogma, as is proved by the consensient judgment of so many ages and nations." J. M'S.

³⁰ Aquila, a Jew, born at Sinope in Pontus, translated the Old Testament into Greek, A.D. 128.

³¹ Symmachus, a Samaritan, of the Ebionite sect, translated the Old Testament, circ. A.D. 200.

³² Theodotion from Ephesus, an Ebionite, his translation must have appeared, A.D. 150.

³³ Lib. xv. c. 9.

The Ruthenian Church.

I.—ITS CONVERSION.

THE rapidly shifting scenes of the world's history give us little time to fix our attention on any one in particular. The proverbial nine days' wonder is a thing of the past, like the "High Flyer" coach, or the City watchman; nine whole days never pass over without a fresh claim on our amazement or interest rising up which makes us forget the last piece of astounding intelligence. Still, in the midst of physical calamities, of railroad accidents, of floods, and famines, the moral catastrophe of the beginning of this year can hardly have escaped the memory of any earnest Catholic. It was then announced with due formality that two hundred thousand Catholics of what once was Poland had in a body gone over to the Russian Church.

It was not long before doubts began to be suggested as to the spontaneity of this conversion, and in course of time the real facts of the case were told in their grim and revolting reality. But while the first news was published in the telegrams of every paper in Europe, the truth appeared only timidly in papers that do not command the largest circulation; and many who read this explanation found that all was strange to them—the victims, their country, one might almost say their cause. The grave has closed over Poland, and though all Europe was deeply interested in her former struggles, a fresh enemy to Christianity has arisen, and the Tsar is now regarded as a possible ally against the present foe.

Perhaps because of all this we have accepted the sedative, the palliative which Russia has put forward, that—after all—these Greeks, even though they may have been rather roughly persuaded into a change of faith, have in reality only been freed from a creed into which they had been much more brutally driven by their former masters, the Latin Catholics of Poland.

Carefully and lovingly are we gathering up each detail of the lives of our English martyrs; learned men are searching in the records of the Catacombs, in the twice turned earth of Roman antiquities for any record of the witnesses of the first ages. Are we to accept as satisfactory the mere dictum of Russian diplomacy, and allow the memory of the martyrs and confessors of our own days to be shrouded by an official statement of the persecutors? Are we at their bidding to forget altogether the brave deeds, the faith unto death of the persecuted? People may cry out, "We have heard enough of persecutions, old and new!" But surely such a speech is unworthy of those whose present peace and liberty have been bought at so dear a price by their forefathers and countrymen. And then again we are not in times of real peace, if ever there were such time; the air is laden with an insidious spirit which effeminates and enervates us, and will leave us little prepared to battle for the truth when the struggle comes, as it surely will come, unless we keep our eyes on those unworldly and heroic men who in spite of every seduction, spite even as we shall see of the absence of sympathy from their brethren in the faith, have battled for justice even to blood.

How far then, we ask, is it true that Russia has only restored religious liberty to the serfs of the Latin Church, and that if her measures to free them have been somewhat severe they were at most not worse than what had been employed to enslave them to the Pope? If people any longer believed in treaties, it could be answered at the outset that on the transfer of the provinces in question to the Russian Crown, the Empress Catharine promised, in the Fifth Article of the Treaty of 1773, that "the Roman Catholics, as relates to religion, will be preserved completely *in statu quo*, that is to say, in the same free exercise of their worship and discipline, with all and such churches and ecclesiastical property which they possessed at the time of their passing under the rule of her Imperial Majesty in the September of 1772; and her said Majesty and her successors will not avail themselves of their sovereign rights to the prejudice of the *status quo* of the Roman Catholic religion in the countries here mentioned."¹

Besides the articles of Père Martinov in the *Etudes*, an article of the April of this year in the *Pszeglad Polski* of Cracow, and *Le Schisme et ses apôtres dans le Diocèse de Chelm*,

¹ Rohrbacker, *Histoire de l'Eglise*, vol. xxviii. p. 413. Gaume, Paris, 1848.

a French translation, which appeared in the *Monde* of last May, of a Polish brochure published in Cracow, our chief authority will be the remarkable work of Dom Guépin, O.S.B., *Saint Josaphat Archevêque de Polock et l'Eglise Grecque-Unie en Pologne*.² It is indeed a volume worthy of the Congregation of Solesmes, the patient labour of the Benedictine, a labour which alone is capable of producing anything worth the publishing, a labour so often wanting to modern productions, which have caught the infection of modern rapidity and the consequent imperfections and unsoundness of popular writing.

Dom Guépin has had to create a history never before chronicled from sources hitherto unpublished and most difficult of access. The strange indifference of the Latin Catholics of Poland to the history and fate of their Eastern brethren in the faith was in great part the cause of the obscurity which clung about the facts. "Our richest libraries contain nothing or next to nothing about the Ruthenians, and still less on the Union of Brzesc (Bjase)."³ And from dry bones, from scanty materials, the Benedictine has made a most interesting and instructive picture of the various epochs of this portion of the Church's history, and has brought out into striking relief the St. Thomas of Canterbury of Eastern Poland, who in spite of his recent canonization was, till this work appeared, hardly known even by name to the Catholic world.

Like all history when carefully written, the volume is full of interest. But the numerous episodes in the story of the Ruthenian Church, the influence of European politics upon her success, the light thrown again and again on the great border war of the Turk against civilization, and on the complicity of the schismatics of Constantinople in the Moslem and Protestant attacks on Christendom are specially valuable.

The Slavonic family occupied from time immemorial the border lands of Europe and Asia, and in St. Jerome and St. Martin of Tours we have two glorious fruits of their early Christianity. The tide of barbarian invasion cut them off for a time from Europe until the sword of Charlemagne opened again a way to them. The Greek monks SS. Methodius and Cyril came with other messengers of peace to replant the Cross in those vast countries. To facilitate their conquest they adopted the language of the people for the sacred ritual of Catholic worship and translated the Scriptures and the litur-

² Poitiers. Henri Oudin, 8vo, 1874.

³ Preface xii.

gical books of the Eastern Church into Slavonic. Wherever the Latin missionaries had penetrated they had brought with them the language and rites of the Western Church. Their converts are to this day children of the true Church, members of European civilization.

The converts of St. Methodius and St. Cyril, whether in Ruthenia or in Moldavia and Wallachia became by the force of the Eastern tradition attached to the Greek Church, and how fatal this has been to these nations history has shown. Their laws, their literature, their teaching came from Constantinople; they looked to its new-fangled patriarch as the immediate source of their doctrine and their sacraments, while differences of rite and liturgical language separated them more and more from the Latin Christians. The difference of rite only increased as time went on. The Latin Church, full of life and vigour, adapted the external forms of worship to the varied circumstances and needs of the time. The immobility of the Eastern rite was a sign and a consequence of the sterility and want of movement which settled down on the Greek Church when once it began to withdraw itself in spirit from the centre of God's Church.

The Greeks looked on their ceremonies as the great mark of their truth, and began to regard with hatred the diminished services of the other rite. Coldness steadily developed into an open rupture, though the Ruthenians did not follow Constantinople in her fatal step of schism at once.

Just as the Moslem was to sweep over Byzantium when a second time it broke from the unity of Christ, so, in the thirteenth century, by the swords of the Tartars under Genkis Khan perished the feeble beginnings of a Ruthenian state. These new barbarians, more ferocious than any that had yet appeared, destroyed ruthlessly all that they found on their way. The hour of distress seemed to foreshadow the hour of release, and cries for help were sent up to the Father of Christendom; it was but for a brief space; the son of the Duke of Moscow repelled the Papal envoys whom his father had invited, and submitted to the Mongols. The seed of the vast Empire of Russia was laid in that alliance.

The invaders found far different foes in the Latin Catholics of Poland, and their repeated invasions were repelled with a heroism and pertinacity which alone would have gained for that ill-fated land the well-earned title of the bulwark of

Christianity. Gradually but surely the portions of Ruthenia or Slavonia, for want of a better name, that bordered on the young and vigorous Catholic kingdom to its west, gravitated towards that state. The people of the Duchy of Holcz were the first voluntarily in 1340 to take their place under the crown of Poland.

More than two hundred and seventy-five years after the definite schism of Constantinople under Cerularius, Ruthenia was still sending Peter Pence to Rome. Even as late as 1580 the schism was not completely adopted by the people or clergy.

To answer the question, who are the Ruthenians? we must consider another element in their nationality. The reply will throw back light on the origin of the schism in Ruthenia. In the north-east frontier of what is now Prussian Poland, an Indo-European race, though not Slavs, the Lithuanians, were entrenched amidst bogs and forests. The light of the Faith had never shone upon them or it had been quenched by the advance of barbarism. And, as late as the thirteenth century, it was only brought to them on the swords and lances of the Teutonic knights who treated them as Christian knights too often treated pagan foes, so that the prophetic voice of St. Bridget some years later was raised against their enormities.

They found in this wild people, men worthy of their steel, who were not only able to hold their own, but who in the following century conquered nearly the whole of Western Ruthenia, and pushed on to the Black Sea. Their position in the midst of hostile nations, pressed at once by the knights their old enemies, the Tartars, and the Muscovites, made them look towards Poland. The Popes, ever anxious to extend the reign of Christ, joyfully accepted the proposals of their chiefs to receive them under His yoke; Latin missionaries penetrated into their country, but the continued hostility of the unworthy knights, spite of Papal prohibition, embittered the people against their creed.

Almost naturally, however, they accepted the faith of their new subjects, and as the wife of Æthelberht was a means of conversion to her husband and her husband's people, so the Christian princesses, whom the heads of the Lithuanians had married, brought their religion into the houses of the great. Unhappily they looked rather to Constantinople than to the

Centre of Unity.⁴ After some opposition and several martyrdoms, among which were the deaths of fourteen martyrs of the great missionary order of St. Francis, the Catholic faith became victorious. The heiress of the crown of Poland, the last of the dynasty of Piast, Hedwiges, was sought in marriage by the half barbarous Jagellon, the Prince of Lithuania. He promised that he and all his people would become Christian and would be united to Poland if she would but accept his hand. For so great a gain the princess sacrificed her own affections and gained a kingdom for Christ and her fatherland. For nearly two hundred years their successors reigned over the united kingdom, and the Ruthenians, how close originally may have been their ties with the Russians of Moscovy—the names of both are but one word spelt in two different ways—in the course of years by inter-marriage, community of history, of interests, and finally of faith, became as Polish as any subjects of the house of Piast.

The fallacies about nationalities which made people base their redistribution of Europe on ethnological research, spite of the overwhelming reasons which counteracted these ancient ties of blood, are now pretty well exploded. The annexation of Savoy, and the re-vindication of Alsace and Lorraine, have proved to the theorist that there are stronger and more real grounds of fellowship than mere identity of race.

The mingling of Tartar and Finnish blood with Ruthenian has created the modern Russian people. The mingling of Lithuanian and Polish blood with Ruthenian has created another people who, call them Russian if you like, are no more so than an Englishman is a German or a Prussian, or a Breton Celt or a native of French Flanders is other than a Frenchman.

King Ladislas the Fifth, for so Jagellon was styled after his baptism, returned to his country with a quantity of Latin priests, who soon converted the people of Lithuania proper to the Faith from the idolatry which they still professed. Numbers of the boyards or nobles already baptized in the Greek rite joined the Latin Church, while emigrations of Poles on a vast scale into the rich but depopulated country just joined to them by the act of union, brought a Latin Catholic

⁴ P. Guépin holds that the Ruthenian schism was consummated as early as the thirteenth century, and speaks of the Ruthenians accepting schismatical baptism, p. lxxiii. *Introd.* We prefer to follow the explicit statements of the Cracow pamphlet mentioned above.

population into the southern provinces of old Ruthenia, where to minister to their wants the Pope established several sees.

But the traditional dislike common to all the Easterns for the Latin rite, a dislike carefully fostered by the schismatical patriarchs of Constantinople, only grew deeper by the establishment of this rite in their midst, and their opposition was encouraged by the example of some of the great Lithuanian nobles of the princely houses, once semi-independent rulers of Ruthenia, who refused altogether to follow the lesser nobles in their junction with the Latin Church.

The act of union between the two crowns in 1413, at Horodlo, in which the sovereign gave up his absolute power over his original dominions and admitted his nobles to a share in all the privileges and liberties of the Polish aristocracy, expressly limited this grace to the members of the "Roman Religion," to those in union with the Chair of St. Peter. The political union could not be complete as long as there was a division, and one so bitter, in the kingdom.

A few years later the advance of the Turk made the last Emperor of the East look towards Rome for safety. Few events gave greater hopes than the Council of Florence: rarely have great hopes been so speedily, so utterly destroyed. The Ruthenian or Greco-slav, Archbishop of Kiew, Isidore, the Metropolitan of his Church, was one of the Fathers who accepted the union, and on his return assembled a synod at Cracow, where he promulgated the decrees and celebrated Mass in his own rite in the cathedral of the capital. The people appeared to share the joy of the Latins at the reconciliation. Ladislas the Third, by a royal decree, placed the United Greeks of his kingdom on a footing of perfect equality with his Latin subjects. But Moscow, like Constantinople, rejected the peace that Archbishop Isidore brought to them; and not only was his life in peril, but after his departure the Tsar erected his capital into a separate Patriarchate, and broke off from all obedience to the ancient Metropolis of Kiew.

Isidore resigned his charge, went to Rome, was made a cardinal, and witnessed, as Legate of the Holy See, the taking and sack of the guilty and rebellious Rome of the East.

The listless Greek, whose religion had, after long years of separation from the centre of light and grace, become cold and almost lifeless, and whose only energy was shown in an unswerving and dogged adherence to the traditional ceremonies

of his rite, had accepted the union. But there seems to have been little or no effort to bring into close and vivifying relations the ancient Church of St. Methodius with the See of Peter. Their inferiority in culture and in earnestness to those of the Latin rite prevented the Ruthenian clergy from availing themselves of the privileges granted by Ladislas. They never took their place in Poland. No signs of open rupture showed themselves, but no living active union ever was accomplished; and when, in 1520, the intrigue of a Russian princess, widow of Alexander the Second of Poland, placed a schismatic in the Metropolitan See of Kiew, the bishops, clergy, and people subject to him passed away almost without a dissentient voice from the obedience of Rome.

The times, too, were evil. The Renaissance, the forerunner of the Reformation, with its numerous abuses, was in full reign. Poland, like nearly every country in Europe, was too ready to catch the fire of religious revolt. But if the new religion spread rapidly in Latin Poland, it simply found no active resistance at all among the Greeks of Ruthenia. It is a fact familiar to all who know anything of Poland that the nation was divided into nobles, burgesses, and the serfs. The last were simple bondsmen, not considered as free agents; and it was quite an understood thing that they had no more liberty to choose their own faith than they had to speak in behalf of their own interests and those of the nation.

The nobles, nearly *en masse*, accepted the convenient doctrines of the new apostles: numbers of the burgesses imitated their example. The common people, as a whole, adhered tenaciously to their old belief. The great families had retained, from the days when they were independent princes, a most arbitrary power over the clergy of their Church. Even during the union they still continued to nominate the bishops. The lower grade of nobility exercised almost a similar authority. The goods of the Church were theirs, just like the land of their serfs. Whatever check religious principle had put to their rapacity, or to their abuse of sacred things, the Reform swept away all scruples or delicacy. One can easily imagine what sort of hierarchy such a system produced. The bishops were separately and severally the creatures of some powerful noble, named by him that he might avail himself of their influence or wealth. Rival prelates fought pitched battles for their sees. There was no court of appeal. The King would not interfere. Rome had

been rejected. Constantinople never troubled herself about her subjects, unless to send envoys to collect an informal tribute. The nobles of Halicz, who had remained faithful to the Greek Church, were revolted at the iniquities committed, and protested, in 1583, to their Metropolitan, who was as bad as the rest, against the horrors that went on around them. Simony was recognized; married men, with their wives and children, occupied the monasteries; the married secular clergy lived as serfs, tilling the ground to get bread for their family—learning was impossible for them.

And with all this the letter of the law, the fasts, the ceremonial observances, were maintained; and the worship of the Latins, their services, which were so much less elaborate than their own, their manner of making the sign of the Cross—worse than all, the fact that their priests shaved their beard, stamped them in the eyes of the ignorant popes and people as impious and detestable heretics, to whom the very Turks were preferable. Such a passionate hate naturally created a link of union with the enemies of Poland; the Muscovites were their brethren in the faith. The Sultan, who held their spiritual ruler in his hands, could at any time fan the religious fury into rebellion when his ambition led him against Central Europe.

Meantime the counter-Reformation was rapidly gaining victory after victory in Europe. The Society of Jesus, to whom the united voice of the Church's enemies gave then as now the title of the champions of Catholicity, was established in Poland. The truly great Bathory, the newly-elected King of Poland, favoured in every way the zeal of the Society, and established in connection with their College at Vilna a Ruthenian side, where the young Slavonic nobles came to gain the best education in Europe, and where many of them received the grace of the true faith. The celebrated Father Possevin, one of the many remarkable men of his time, on his great errand to restore the Tsar to the unity of the Church, saw the miseries of Ruthenia, and both he and Father Skarga, perhaps the most distinguished preachers in Poland, recognized clearly that the true way to establish the nation in Catholic unity was not by converting it to Latin Christianity, but by leaving it in possession of its ancient liturgy, and yet joining it by close and real ties to the Chair of Peter. Many of the laity of Ruthenia, struck by the revival of religion among the Latins, desired to raise up

their fallen and degraded Church; and among them the most powerful and the most zealous was the Prince Ostrogski, the first and wealthiest nobleman of all Poland. Father Skarga had tried to win him to union, but in vain. The Prince put himself into communication with Constantinople. The burgesses followed the example of their betters. Great confraternities were formed to promote personal holiness and the interests of their Church; and a schismatical Patriarch of Antioch arrived to direct the movement, and to hinder its natural development in the direction of Catholicity. He was followed by the Patriarch of Constantinople in person, who, though he strenuously opposed all idea of union, by his arbitrary conduct and extortions was the best advocate of the cause he had come to overthrow.

Ostrogski himself favoured the scheme of a joint synod of Latins and Greeks to talk over their differences; and in 1590, at Brzesc, the Ruthenian Bishops declared their independence of the Eastern Church, and offered to Sigismund the Third the supreme religious authority over them. The King refused the tempting offer, and urged them to submit to the divinely appointed head of all the Churches. The Bishops all, or nearly all, resolved at a private meeting to accept his Majesty's suggestion, on the condition that their ancient rites were guaranteed to them. Cyril Terlecki, Greek Bishop of Luck, was the soul of the movement. Ostrogski, who wanted to be the doer of so great a deed, and who had quarrelled with Cyril, placed a relative of his own in the see of Wlodomir; but Hypatius Pociay (Potsiay) at once assumed with the mitre the spirit of a bishop and told his patron plainly that it was not for him to be the spokesman of his Church, or to treat its affairs in so off-hand a manner.

The negotiations went forward rapidly, thanks in great part to the zeal of the Latin Bishop of Luck, Bernard Macieowski, the former school-fellow of St. Stanislaus at the Jesuit College at Vienna, and in after life a Cardinal. In 1595, the whole of the Ruthenian Episcopate signed their adhesion to the Council of Florence, and Clement the Eighth had the happiness of receiving their submission through their two envoys, Hypatius, Bishop of Wlodomir, and Cyril, Bishop of Luck, at a public consistory in the hall of Constantine.

The Pontiff wept tears of joy at the solemn act which apparently brought a whole people back to communion with the Holy See. But already Prince Ostrogski had published a

manifesto to his countryman, denouncing the bishops as traitors to their Church. The schismatics at once responded to the appeal, and, sadder still, two of the Bishops withdrew from the Union of Brzesc. The Patriarch of Constantinople was written to, and he despatched his chancellor instantly to Poland. Ostrogski tried to rally the Ruthenian nobility to his side, but only a few answered his appeal, while, on the contrary, weary of the strife and disorder, they went over in numbers to the Latin Church. Then he conspired with the Cossacks of the Ukraine who came over the borders to wreak their vengeance on the Uniate Bishops. Proofs of his complicity were found in the papers of Nicephoros, the emissary of the Greek Patriarch. A more successful alliance was made with the Protestants, whom they hoped even to unite, much as modern schismatics are endeavouring to do, on doctrinal points with the Greeks. It was easier to combine an alliance on the common ground of hatred of the Pope; and the effect of that alliance has lasted to our days. The Union of Brzesc has, thanks to the concentrated fire of attacks to which it has been subjected by Protestant and schismatic writers, come to be looked upon with dislike by even the most patriotic and well-meaning among the Poles. Unfortunately, the energy of the Episcopate was, as well might be imagined, by no means all that was required to meet such vigorous and concerted opposition.

But God had raised up His champion, as He ever does, in the hour of need. A shopboy in Vilna was to be the saviour of His people. Josaphat Kuncewicz (Koontsavitch) lived in a city where every form of error had its church. Brought up from childhood in the Greek Church, it held his affections. In the persons of the Jesuit Fathers, he saw the zeal, the holiness of Rome. One would have thought that he would have, like so many, adopted their rite. But he had another duty, another call. He vowed himself to God as a Basilian monk, in the only Order known in the Eastern Church, but of which the ruins alone then remained. The Monastery of the Holy Trinity, which he entered had been desecrated; its supposed patrons had divided it amongst themselves. Monks there were none. The titular superior was merely titular; a schismatic held possession of the church. For three years Josaphat led a buried life in the one cell he found empty. Temptations of discouragement came across him; but heaven protected the precious seed of future Catholicity in Ruthenia.

It must be borne in mind that celibacy did not exist among the secular clergy of the Greek Church. All the bishops are therefore taken from the cloister. The only hope for the maintenance of the Union lay in the reformation of the Greek monks, and for this great work had Josaphat been set aside. Before many years he found himself at the head of a large and pious community. Another invaluable helper came to him in the person of John Rutski, the story of whose life is only surpassed in interest by that of the saint his friend. He had, to tell it in short, received the best of secular education as the son of a Calvinistic gentleman. A shameful snare laid to his virtue while a student at Prague confirmed him in his desire to become a Catholic, and he broke away from his licentious companions and was received into the Church by the Rector of the Jesuit College. He wanted to be a Jesuit or a Carmelite; but the strongest of obstacles stood in his way. Three years' study at Rome increased his love of the Latin Church, but the Pope forbade him to enter it. His place was among his countrymen; he could only reach them by becoming one of their own rite. At last his opposition suddenly ceased, and he became one of the novices under St. Josaphat.

We must reserve for some other time the life and struggles of the blessed martyr. The union between the Protestants and the schismatics culminated in an open rebellion, which was quickly suppressed, and was the death-blow of the Protestant cause in Poland. The house of Ostrogski perished; but the active hostilities of the schismatic confraternities continued. In 1614, Rutski became the metropolitan of the United Greeks, and he at once made St. Josaphat Abbot or Archimandrite of his monastery of the Holy Trinity.

Four years later the holy abbot became Bishop of Polock. Before he left his monastery the Basilians had undergone a complete reform, and the activity and energy of Latin religious life had been infused into the venerable Order of the East. His zeal and love gained multitudes of souls to the Union. He accepted the defence of the Society of Jesus against the passionate prejudices which schism and heresy had created against that Order; he continued to place in the fathers that confidence which their old affection to him and their zeal for God's glory had never belied. Though Russian papers have decried St. Josaphat as a persecutor, and have justified their own proceedings by this accusation, Dom Guépin shows clearly

by a number of contemporary witnesses, that he never did more than invoke the common law of the country to wrest from the hands of the schismatics the churches or monasteries they illegally occupied. While hating schism and heresy, he loved both schismatics and heretics. More zealous converts blamed his tolerance as completely opposed to the maxims of his days.

One of the greatest obstacles to the consolidation of the Greek Catholic Church in Poland was the wholesale adoption of the Latin rite by the Ruthenian upper classes. The aristocratic prejudice of the Poles objected to a priest, much more to a bishop, whose parents had been serfs. But if all the nobles left the Greek Church, how else was the clergy to be recruited but from the sons of the soil? And again, this separation created an idea that the Greeks were but a handful of poor people, unworthy of the sympathy of their high-born Latin brethren.

How all this told against the Union was seen when the wild people of the Ukraine, half Cossacks half fugitives from justice, were fanaticized into open warfare on behalf of the schism by an envoy from Constantinople. The episode which culminated in the battle of Choczyn—so famed for the share St. Stanislaus had in the victory—is exceedingly interesting, and brings out strongly the complicity of Eastern schism and Western heresy in one of the most tremendous attempts of Mahometanism on the life of Europe. A Patriarch of Jerusalem appears in the midst of the Cossacks, excites them by his promises to defend their ancient faith, and then creates by his own hand a complete schismatic hierarchy in opposition to the Bishops then ruling peacefully in Ruthenia. Cyril Lucaris, the crypto-Calvinist, was schismatical Patriarch of Constantinople, and supported by England and Holland, he plotted with the Turk the ruin of Poland. Bethlehem Gabor was upholding the Protestant cause in Transylvania and Hungary, and the imperial city of Vienna itself had been wrested from his hands only by the timely aid of Poland. Gustavus Adolphus, aided by a subsidy of forty thousand florins a month paid him by the Government of the Hague, had invaded the northern frontier of the Catholic kingdom, while Osman was preparing an immense army to march upon Poland. It was expected that the whole of Ruthenia would rise at his approach. But the Patriarch of Jerusalem had overstated both his own influence, and the number and strength of his adherents.

However, the continued agitation which was kept up in the Eastern provinces, the complaints of the schismatics to the Diet, the indifference of the Latins, the dislike of the Polish statesmen to any internal trouble when their country was menaced from without, all contributed to make the Government wish for peace, or, in other words, to desire to satisfy the demands of the new hierarchy. But for the ardent pleadings of Rutski, and still more for the positive declaration of King Sigismund that he would rather lay down his crown than do the smallest injury to Holy Church, the work of St. Josaphat would have been overthrown. When the holy Archbishop returned from the Diet to his see he found that the efforts of the schismatics had been concentrated upon it; with the exception of the clergy, almost all his flock had been led astray. Public riots took place in the various towns, and the Cossacks openly declared that nothing would content them but an official recognition of the schismatical hierarchy. Even the Vice-Chancellor of Lithuania, Sapieha, a zealous Catholic, and one of the first statesmen of the kingdom, wrote a letter couched in such strong terms to the Saint charging him with being the cause of all these disturbances, that the Russian Government in after years sent a copy of it to Rome as a conclusive argument against his canonization.

The demonstrations grew more frequent; it was evident how matters would end. St. Josephat longed to give peace to his flock at the price of his life. As the danger grew greater, as the Government grew more inclined to give way to the clamours of men who knew how to profit by the weakness of Poland, St. Josaphat went to one of the towns of his diocese where his life was openly menaced by the excited people.

On Saturday, the 11th of November, 1623, on pretence of avenging the imprisonment of a pope, who, according to a fixed plan had sought by studied insult to be apprehended, the mob broke into the Archbishop's house, and just as he had raised his hands to bless them his head was cloven by an axe, and in a few moments the fury of his murderers had stamped out almost every vestige of his face. When the sack of the palace was over, and the body was stripped, the long and cruel hair-shirt he had always worn was discovered, and the wretches would not believe that it could be the body of the man whose memory had been so blackened by the calumnies of his enemies. But his servants who were appealed to declared that it was

St. Josaphat's. The hair-shirt was laden with stones, tied round his neck, and his corpse was flung into the deepest part of the river Dwina.

The blood of the martyr had its full effect. The body was recovered and was found whole and as of one that slept, with the broad scars and wounds upon it, yet beautiful to look upon. Stranger and more wonderful was the change made in the town. The conversion of the head magistrate was the first fruits, and the whole of the townsfolk became other men.

From one end of Poland to another there was but one feeling of veneration for the martyr and sympathy for his cause. The Cossacks were subdued, and the power of the intruded hierarchy fell with them. Its chief became a convert, and though he once quailed before the fear of death, he speedily repented. The open wound of Ruthenian Catholicity, the liberty of the Greek Catholics to pass to the Latin rite, was closed by Papal authority, while Latin priests and religious were called in to reorganize and to instruct their Eastern brethren.

Other struggles were still in store for the Church. The growing independence of the nobles, the increasing weakness of the Crown, enabled the schismatics and the Cossacks to profit by the stormy meetings of the Diet to renew their intrigues; and when a weak irreligious prince like Ladislas the Fourth came to the throne the schismatical hierarchy was again recognized, and Rome had to complain once more of the open indifference of the Latin Catholics for the fate of their brethren in the Faith. The clergy remained faithful to their pastors. In a portion of the diocese once ruled over by St. Josaphat, and which had been given over to a schismatical bishop, but two out of six hundred priests betrayed their trust. The new pacification, as it was called, handed over a number of churches to the schismatics, and Rutski, who went to Rome to defend his cause against the Polish ambassador, could assert that to give way in this matter would be to give up to schism a number of souls who were members of the true Church. It was at once an unjust and impolitic measure, and Cyril Lucaris must have rejoiced to see the success of his plans, which at once ensured the vitality of the schism, and left in the heart of Poland the fatal germ of its future dismemberment.

In 1637, the Athanasius of his Church, the saintly and intrepid Rutski, went to his rest. Three millions of souls are said to have been won back by him to the truth. Hardly a dozen

Catholics could be found in the days of his youth to attend the service at Holy Trinity at Vilna.

A fresh invasion of the Cossacks, the growing power of Russia, the natural supporter of its allies in Ruthenia, did not check the progress of the Faith. In 1671, while the Catholics counted their churches by thousands, the schismatics possessed but seventy, spite of the great liberty and privileges which rebellion and foreign alliances had procured for them. It was during the wars of religion that Blessed Andrew Bobola fell into the hands of a body of Cossacks, and bore his tortures so bravely for the truth of Christ. And he was only one of an army of martyrs. As many as forty-six of the Jesuits gave up their life about the same time and in the same cause, and the Children of St. Francis and of St. John of God in almost equal numbers. Three Benedictines and more than forty Basilian monks, a hundred Uniate and Latin priests, swelled the white-robed choir. But above all the rest, the great Preaching Order stands first by the long list of its children who, as always, in the van, fell before the swords and torches of the savage hordes. For ever after the Dominican Fathers of the Ruthenian Province wore a scarlet girdle in memory of these glories. The victory was definitely won, and except in those provinces which had passed under the dominion of Russia, the Union grew steadily and increased swiftly, till the hour of Poland's destruction was sealed, and the first partition of that unhappy kingdom took place.

F. G

*The Discovery of St. Antony.*¹

IN the December of 1220, a few months after entering the Franciscan Order, Antony received with a joyful heart the obedience he so greatly desired, to go to Africa. It is uncertain whether, by special permission, he was professed before leaving Europe. The Provincial gave him, as a companion, Fra Filippo, a Spanish lay-brother, who had the same desire for martyrdom as St. Antony,² a desire which it was not the will of God to satisfy in either case; neither was Africa to be the scene of St. Antony's labours. He fell sick of a violent fever immediately after landing, and could not shake it off the whole winter. Accordingly both he and his companion were recalled to their own Province by their Superiors after four months. But Portugal was not the country in which he was to do a great work in a short time for the glory of God and the salvation of men: and the ship in which he sailed was in sight of a Spanish port, when a sudden storm came on and drove her to the coast of Sicily.

Antony was so ill and prostrate from the effects of his long illness, and the voyage, that he was obliged to stay some time at Messina to gain a little strength before travelling to Assisi, where he intended to be present at the General Chapter of the Order which was to be held there at Pentecost, and to enjoy the happiness of seeing its holy Founder. He remained in Sicily till after Easter, and then he and Fra Filippo set out for Assisi.

¹ The following pages are extracted from the forthcoming volume, *The Chronicle of St. Antony of Padua*. St. Antony, as is well known, was originally an Augustinian Canon Regular in Portugal, and was led to enter the Franciscan Order, when he was already a priest, in hopes of being sent to Africa to preach to the Mahometans and gain the crown of martyrdom, like the Five Friars whose relics were brought to Coimbra while he was an Augustinian.

² Fra Filippo was present at the death of St. Francis: he died at the age of eighty-seven, in the Monastery of Colombaio, near Monte Alcinio: many miracles were wrought at his tomb.

Antony had felt keenly the disappointment of Africa and losing his hopes of martyrdom: and although he accepted the will of God uncomplainingly, he resolved to compensate, as far as possible, for the loss he had sustained, by offering Him not only the sacrifice of a life of continual penance, but that of his honour and reputation. He carefully concealed every sign of learning and talent, and gave everybody the idea that he was an ignorant and illiterate person, very much below the average in intelligence and capacity. It was the easier for him to do this, as his humility had led him studiously to hide his gifts while he was in the Monastery of the Olives. The wonder seems to be that his saintly artifice was so completely successful as to deceive St. Francis himself, who was so marvellous a discerner of the conscience, that St. Bonaventure tells us that he possessed the infused gift of reading the souls of his children. But such gifts are only bestowed, as St. Paul says, "in part," for purposes for which God intends them to be used. And it was the will of God to veil the lustre of this hidden gem till the time came when He was pleased to reveal it. Thus it was that in this instance He withheld from St. Francis his wonted illumination, or else he inspired him to cooperate with His designs by concealing the knowledge of the truth which he really possessed.

However this may be, the Portuguese friar's reception was what would ordinarily be considered most discouraging and humiliating. St. Francis seemed to take little notice of him. Everybody passed him over, no one would have anything to do with him. He was away from his own Province and Superiors, and they had no knowledge of his presence in Italy, so as to have given any information about him. His companion, though only a lay-brother, easily found a place in the Monastery of Città di Castello; the business of the Chapter was concluded, every one else was disposed of, one after another left the place of meeting, and Antony was left neglected and almost alone. His sickly and weakened body helped his own humility in making him thus despised. It is said that he had determined to leave the disposal of himself entirely to Providence, and so made no application either to St. Francis or any one else for employment. He would ask for nothing and refuse nothing. Father Gratian, the Provincial of Romagna, happened to notice him. He was looking out for a priest to say Mass at a very small hospice, where six lay-brothers formed the community,

and he asked the feeble and ailing stranger whether he were a priest. "I am," was the simple reply. Had he as yet any destination? "No." Father Gratian on the spot sent him to Montepaolo, a very lonely place near Forli, whither he at once betook himself, entering on his duties as chaplain with great joy, and devoting himself to a life of extreme silence and penance.

The Superior of the community was a lay-brother. Antony fell at his feet, begging him with tears to employ him in some way which might be a relief to himself and his companions. With great joy he agreed to undertake the washing of the kitchen utensils and sweeping of the house. He was in the habit of spending long hours in prayer and penitential exercises in a sort of cave or grotto, but before taking possession of it he obtained leave of the Superior to request permission for its use of one of the lay-brothers who kept some of his tools there. This cave became, in fact, his abode during the nine months he spent at Montepaolo, a time devoted to continual prayer, and to fasts and penances equal in severity to any practised by the most mortified solitaries of the desert. It was a time of preparation, in which God was forming and perfecting the future Apostle of His Church. But while his soul was fed and strengthened by this divine intercourse, and illuminated by many wonderful lights, his body, already enfeebled by sickness, became so weak from his prolonged austerities that sometimes he could scarcely stand, and was obliged to be supported when walking.

Old chroniclers of the "Gesta" of St. Antony are fond of comparing this "hermitage of Montepaolo" to the cells of the solitaries of the Thebaid. It was in a wild and mountainous part of Tuscany, about ten miles from Forli. Not a trace exists of the monastery; but, near the grotto consecrated by the prayers and penances of the Saint, a chapel or oratory was built in 1629, by a Signor Paganelli, in gratitude for a miraculous recovery obtained by St. Antony. Emmanuel Azevedo, the Saint's biographer, who visited the spot, says that half way up the mountain he came upon a spring of the most beautifully clear water, which though it fell into a basin hollowed in the earth, remained perfectly limpid. He adds that it was then the rainy season, and all the other springs of the neighbourhood were thick and muddy. He was assured, not merely by the peasants, but by priests, and other educated persons, that in the

most violent storms of wind it is always quite calm and still on "St. Antony's mountain," and that this was so well known by travellers, that in tempestuous weather they were always anxious to reach that spot, and enjoy a quiet breathing-space. He was told that three very old poplars formerly grew near the fountain, from which the faithful used to cut pieces to take away with them. Crowds of pilgrims used to visit the oratory, and about two hundred silver *ex votos* still witnessed to their devotion. A room was still in the house of the Corbici family, which a well-founded tradition recorded to have been occupied by the Saint when journeying from Montepaolo to Forli; and a copy of the Bible existed which was given by him to the same friendly family. Another interesting memorial was cut down about eighty years ago—a very aged oak outside one of the gates of Forli, under which St. Antony was said to have been in the habit of praying.

Antony spent nine months in the solitude of Montepaolo. But at last the time came when his light was to shine forth. Like the Forerunner of our Lord, he had been "in the deserts," where uninterrupted communion with God had "strengthened him in spirit;" and the Lent of 1222 was to be "the day of his manifestation." He was summoned to Forli, where the Provincial, Father Gratian, was about to hold a Chapter of the Order. It was the time of the ordinations, and besides priests, there were present some friars in minor orders, who were to be ordained by the Bishop of Forli. There were some Dominican fathers there, perhaps for the ordinations, making themselves companions to the friars of St. Francis out of brotherly kindness and charity.

It seems quite uncertain who were the hosts and who were the guests on the occasion, as the Franciscans had no monastery in Forli for a long time after this date, and, though the Dominicans had a church and monastery there in the lifetime of their great founder, these do not seem to have been as yet begun, or at least completed. However, the time came for a spiritual conference, a practice in the Order of St. Francis, and a friendly contest sprang up as to who should address the united body. If the Dominicans were at home, it would be natural for them to insist on the office being discharged by one of the strangers, and if, as is more probable, the Franciscans had received the others in some humble hospice which belonged to them, they would only have been acting

on the beautiful courtesy of religious life in begging their visitors to break to them the food of the Word of God. The end of the conflict was that the Superior of the Franciscans turned to Father Antony, and bade him preach on the spur of the moment. It has been thought that he imagined that his Order could lose no credit at the failure of one who was so simple and unlettered; but we may be allowed to think that the command was not given without some reference in the mind of the Superior to the austere and penitential virtues for which he must have been already known among his brethren.

Antony himself was filled with confusion: He had never preached in his life, though all his life had been, in the Providence of God, a course of training for the highest achievements which lie within the reach of the greatest preachers in the Church. Not only had he never preached, but he had never opened a book except his Breviary since he became a Friar Minor. The Superior was inflexible in rejecting the excuses of the humble priest. Antony said he was a poor ignorant man, who had been fitly employed in washing the dishes in the kitchen. No spiritual person would see in that any disqualification for the highest work in the Church. The Superior told Antony he knew all that he could say, and ordered him to preach out of obedience. The tradition seems too intrinsically probable to be doubted, and the words of the Superior furnished St. Antony with his text, "*Christ became for us obedient unto death, even the death of the Cross.*" He may have intended when he began, to speak a few plain ordinary words on the subject of the season, the obedience of the Son of God for our sakes. His words flowed out like a grand stream which had long been pent up, and was now at last free. The discourse fell into a beautiful order, passages from the Scripture and the Fathers taking their due places in the argument as it proceeded to unfold itself, while every word breathed the most intense feeling and the deepest unction, the language was clear and powerful, the voice sweet and sonorous, every gesture and motion full of grace and simple majesty.

The audience was rapt in astonishment and delight. No one had ever so preached before. They were but few in the little chamber in which the conference was given, but their fewness had not prevented the instantaneous revelation of a holy preacher of the highest grade, the man for whom Italy had long

been waiting, who was to have the power to root out the heresies by which the population was already deeply infected, the man on whose lips thousands were to hang, who was to be a burning and shining light to one great multitude after another. There is no power on earth that can be compared, on its own line, to the power of eloquence. But the eloquence which thrills the crowds of men in some time of political agitation, which influences or excites the "madness of the people," as the Psalmist says, and is so often responsible for evil deeds as well as for the enthusiasm of devoted patriotism, is poor indeed when compared with the higher outbursts of the spiritual eloquence of those to whom God has given the great commission to preach His Word before peoples and nations, and on whom He lavishes the natural and intellectual gifts which are required for their high position, fitting them moreover by special graces and training for its discharge: while at the same time He pours out upon their hearers the graces which enable them to profit in an extraordinary degree by the mighty power which He has intrusted to His servants. The need for the work to which Antony was called had long been heavily felt, and now the time and the man had come by the sweet and powerful agency of God's secret Providence. Everything in the career of the Saint, as far as we have hitherto traced it, had conspired in its degree to produce the result which God had intended from the first. The martyrs of Morocco, the Canons Regular at Coimbra, the storms of the Mediterranean, the sickness in Africa, the accidents which had made Antony unknown at Assisi, his own deep humility, the compassion of Father Gratian, the solitude and humiliations of Montepaolo, and now the inspiration which had guided the Superior at Forli in this chance meeting between a handful of Dominicans and Franciscans—all had brought about the counsel of God, and the Apostle of Italy, the "Hammer of heretics," was manifested and recognized as soon as he opened his lips in humble obedience to a man who knew nothing of his gifts.

The manner in which St. Antony was thus manifested, as well as the manifestation itself, must have made the Franciscans feel absolutely at ease as to the will of God with regard to the disposal of the treasure which they had so unexpectedly discovered. Here, they knew, was a man who had most studiously hidden himself from the applause of men, and had sought to

be unknown and despised far more industriously and successfully than most others to be honoured and admired. God Himself had revealed a saint as well as a great preacher. The Provincial of Romagna seems to have been on the spot at the time, and he instantly appointed Antony preacher in his Province. He wrote also to inform St. Francis of what had happened, St. Francis joyfully confirmed the appointment, extending the field within which Antony was to preach to all the Provinces of the Order. The "hidden life" of our Saint was now over. He never lost his love for retirement, for prayer, for penance and fasting, but he never again was allowed to give himself to them unreservedly. He had a great work to do, and few years of life to do it in, though he still lacked some years of the age at which our Lord and Master had left Nazareth to begin His own Public Life. We may be sure that Antony's heart often reverted with intense longing to that lonely hospice which had been to him somewhat like the lonely peaks of Quarantana to our Lord. And, wherever he went, and however busily he was occupied during the remainder of his life, he was still the humble priest who had been raised so high in spiritual lore in the grotto of Montepaolo.

The short remainder of his life was full of very great activity, broken by occasional seasons of retirement and study. The Romagna was the first scene of this activity. He spent six months in several of its towns with wonderful success. From Forlì he went to Faenza, Imola, Rimini, and Bologna, and adjacent villages and hamlets, gaining, in every place, signal and innumerable victories over heresy and wickedness of every kind, victories which were the fruits of humility and prayer as well as of eloquence. St. Bonaventure quotes the following prayer composed by him, which he used before preaching :

"O Light of the world, infinite God, Father of eternity, Giver of wisdom and knowledge, and ineffable Dispenser of every spiritual grace, Who knowest all things before they are made, Who makest the darkness and the light, put forth Thy hand and touch my mouth, and make it as a sharp sword to utter eloquently Thy words. Make my tongue, O Lord, as a chosen arrow, to declare faithfully Thy wonders ; put Thy Spirit, O Lord, in my heart that I may perceive, in my soul that I may retain, and in my conscience that I may meditate ; do Thou lovingly, holily, mercifully, clemently, and gently inspire me with Thy grace ; do Thou teach, guide, and strengthen the

comings in and the goings out of my senses and my thoughts, and let Thy discipline instruct me even to the end, and the counsel of the Most High help me through Thine infinite wisdom and mercy. Amen."

From the very beginning, Antony's preaching was confirmed by miracles; nay, his preaching was itself a wonderful miracle. Whether we suppose him to have preached in Latin or Portuguese, it was nothing short of miraculous that he was understood with perfect ease by the most ignorant audience; and if, as is expressly stated by several authors, he was in the habit of preaching in Italian in Italy, and in French in France, his perfect mastery of these two languages is at least equally marvellous, for he had never learnt the latter in any way, and, with regard to the former, the only knowledge he had of it was from the brief intercourse with six ignorant lay-brothers, which broke in upon the long silence and solitude of Montepaolo. The only explanation is that he had the gift of tongues. We shall find him later on, at Rome, not only perfectly understood by men of different nationalities, but heard by each speaking in his own language, even as were the Apostles at Pentecost. Moreover, another wonderful circumstance attended St. Antony's preaching, of which we shall by-and-bye find notable instances at Padua and Brescia. This is, that however vast the numbers to whom he was speaking, there was not a single person, however distant from him, to whom his voice did not sound perfectly clear and distinct.

Romagna was, at this period, deeply tainted with the heresy, whose followers are known in history by the names of Waldenses, Albigenses, and Patareni. History tells us enough of the miserable state of the country from the frequent wars and invasions of those times, the factions which set city against city, and parties in the same city against each other, as well as of the corruption of manners, the acts of violence, the domestic feuds, and the unbridled licence and profligacy of the wealthier and more powerful classes. To all these plagues was added the most deadly of all—the plague of a prevalent and insidious heresy. "Italy," says the old Franciscan chronicle, "was all overturned and filled with confusion by all the other nations who came in to blooden their barbarous swords in her body, invited so to do by the Italians themselves, who called them in to take part in their intestine feuds, and who were all to be in the event their prey, as it turned out. And thus there not

only failed among them those sweet manners which used to make the Italians like to angels on earth, and placed them above all nations in courtesy and charity, but there died away also in them that blessed Faith, for the love of which they had renounced the empire of the world, placing their necks under the most sweet yoke of Christ, and of His Immaculate Holy Roman Catholic Church. And as it happens so often that people take their customs from the company they keep, even the Italians drank of that horrible chalice of Heresy and Abomination, and by means of licence of life, which was then at its highest point, heretics began to multiply in the land."¹

The historians of the Church speak in the gravest terms of the danger to religion and civilization which existed at the beginning of the thirteenth century, from the prevalence of a heresy which seems to us so strange as that of the Albigenses. "In the second and third centuries of the Church," says Bishop Héfèle, "the question might have been asked who would carry the day, Christianity or the dualism of the Manichæans and Gnostics. A thousand years later, the same question might have been raised, and the danger which then threatened the Christian Church and civilization was more serious than at the time of the earlier crisis. To find another danger equally terrible, we must refer to the eighth century, when Islamism, established in Spain and on the coast of Africa, threatened to swallow up the whole West. And yet this last peril was really not so great as that of which we are about to treat, and to oppose it there was not only the religious sentiment, but also that of nationality. On the contrary, in the twelfth and thirteenth centuries, the spirit of nationality was most often on the same side with error, in the countries, for instance, in which the debate arose, that is, among the Slavs of the Greek Church, and in the countries in which the conflict became most bitter, that is, in the south of France. In the conflict with the Cathari, there was no longer question of this or that form of Christian dogma, any more than of this or that organization of the Church. The questions were not questions of confessions, such as agitate Europe in our times, but, in a word, the battle was fought on the ground of Christianity itself."²

The words which we have quoted were written some years ago, and perhaps the recent manifestations of the spirit of error

¹ *Cronique de S. Francesco*, pt. i. l. v. c. 18.

² Héfèle, *Hist. des Conciles*. French Translation, t. viii. p. 61.

in Europe may be considered as warranting a more close parallel, than is here admitted between the danger to faith in the thirteenth century and that which threatens it in the latter half of the nineteenth. In our own country, as well as on the Continent, the question of the day has passed from the ground of this or that particular doctrine of the Creed to that of the unity of Christianity as a whole. The great definition of the Fourth Lateran Council, which was directed against the heretics of the days of St. Antony, looks as much like a re-affirmation of the ancient Creed, of the doctrine about God, the Trinity in Unity, the Creation, the Incarnation, and the other great truths which are the very essence of Christianity itself, as the first chapter of the Vatican Council. Yet, as the author already quoted says, "almost every word is directed against the Cathari," and we may add, almost every word is denied by the "heretics" of our own time.

Mazzini and Young Italy.

THE secret society that after the failures of the Carbonari took the lead in the revolutionary movements of Italy was the *Giovine Italia*, or "Young Italy," which by the activity of its members soon threw all other associations of the same character into the shade. This society owed its origin to Joseph Mazzini.

This remarkable man was a Genoese by birth, the son of parents, as he himself tells us, of democratic principles, under whose influence he unconsciously sucked in those views that determined the complexion of his future life. The recent republican era in France formed the frequent subject of the conversation of his father and friends, and the impression thus produced on his mind was strengthened by the perusal of Livy and Tacitus, and of such old French newspapers as he met with behind his father's medical books. But it was when he was about thirteen years of age that the final impulse was given that was to settle for ever Mazzini's stormy career. One Sunday in April, he tells us, he was walking in the Strada Nuova of Genoa with his mother and an old friend of the family, when they were accosted by some of the refugees who had been engaged in the Piedmontese insurrection that had just been suppressed. One of these men, a tall black-bearded man with a severe, energetic countenance and a fiery glance, never afterwards forgotten, held out a white handkerchief towards the party, merely saying, "For the refugees of Italy;" and from that moment the boy's future course received its irrevocable determination. This incident so trifling in itself, as in many a parallel case where the greatest results have so often followed from the most insignificant causes, turned Joseph Mazzini into the life-long conspirator in furtherance of the ideas that then seized upon him and subsequently dominated over his whole being. From that time forward, sombre and absorbed amongst his fellow-students, the boy appeared like one suddenly grown old. He determined to dress

in black, as a token of mourning for his country, and so far did matters go that his mother became terrified lest he should commit suicide.

Mazzini, as has been said in a former article, joined the Carbonari in 1828, and though dissatisfied with the spirit and mode of operation of that association, he continued an active member of the body, and shared in its schemes and reverses until the failure of 1831 finally deprived the Carbonari of much of their prestige.

It was in 1831 that Mazzini commenced the formation of his new society, the conception of which had occurred to him in the solitary hours of his imprisonment at Savona, where he had been sent after his arrest in Genoa in 1830. This new association was "Young Italy." Its organization was simple. Mr. O'Clery thus describes it.

It was to include all the Liberal youth of the Peninsula, and no one was admitted who had passed the age of forty years. In its organization and its objects, it was essentially different from the Carbonari. The organization was as simple as possible. There were only two classes of members; the first consisting of those who were merely initiated, the second of those who had sufficient intelligence and prudence to justify their being authorized to select and affiliate new members. In the chief towns of the more important districts there were committees charged with the work of perfecting and extending the organization. In smaller places there were simply directors appointed to superintend the action of the initiators. At Marseilles, Mazzini and his friends formed the central committee, which governed the association. But this committee was entirely under his influence, so that practically he himself had the personal command of the whole. By thus placing the directorate abroad, he secured it from the attacks of the Italian Governments, and was able to conspire against them in perfect safety (p. 163).

The distinctive feature of Young Italy was that it had a very definite aim and object. The members "join this association in the firm intent of consecrating both thought and action to the great aim of reconstituting Italy as one independent sovereign nation of free men and equals."¹ Young Italy was therefore *unitarian*; to strive for the unity of Italy was of its very essence. But it was also *republican*, "because theoretically every nation is destined by the law of God and humanity, to form a free and equal community of brothers; and the republican is the only form of government that insures this future. Because all

¹ *Life and Writings of Joseph Mazzini*, vol. i. p. 96.

true sovereignty resides essentially in the nation, the sole progressive and continuous interpreter of the supreme moral law."²

But this ultimate aim of Young Italy involved other proximate aims. "The aim of the association is revolution; but its labours will be essentially educational, both before and after the day of revolution; and it therefore declares the principles upon which the national education should be conducted, and from which alone Italy may hope for safety and regeneration."³

In the fourth section of the instructions for the members of Young Italy these aims are further enlarged upon under the designation of means; means, that is, by which Young Italy proposes to attain its final object. These are education and insurrection to be adopted simultaneously, and made to harmonize with each other. Education must be conducted by example, word and pen; nay, insurrection, whenever it can be realized, must be so carried on as to render it a means of national education. Therefore a fund must be maintained for this work of education, which must necessarily entail great expenditure, forasmuch as education must from the force of circumstances be secret in Italy, though open and above board in other lands. For the mission of the Italian exiles is to constitute an apostolate for the propagation of the principles of Young Italy in other lands and to diffuse especially its principles of insurrection. Each member of Young Italy is bound to pay a monthly contribution of fifty centimes; those whose circumstances admitted of it being called upon for a greater amount. The banner of Young Italy was to display the colours of white, red, and green, and to bear on the one side the words, *Liberty, Equality, Humanity*, and on the other, *Unity and Independence*.

Then follows a long oath to be taken by each member in the presence of the initiator, in which, after much of a rhetorical character, there is the engagement "to obey all the instructions, in conformity with the spirit of Young Italy, given me by those who represent with me the union of my Italian brothers; and to keep the secret of these instructions, even at the cost of my life." The whole concludes with the words, "This I do swear, invoking upon my head the wrath of God, the abhorrence of man, and the infamy of the perjurer, if I ever betray the whole or a part of this my oath."⁴

The formation of Young Italy was followed by the issue of a lengthy manifesto towards the end of the year 1831. A journal

² *Life and Writings*, p. 100.

³ *Ibid.* p. 99.

⁴ *Ibid.* p. 113.

entitled *Young Italy* was started as the organ of the association, the pages of which were filled with fiery appeals to the Italian people to carry on war to the knife with their Governments and with the Austrians, and an active propaganda was organized for the dissemination of their publications. The society spread with great rapidity, and by the middle of 1833 had become very powerful. It was strongest in Lombardy, the Genoese territory, Tuscany, and the States of the Church; but it had its ramifications also in Naples and in Piedmont. The youth of Italy, to whom Mazzini especially appealed, crowded into the association, and it had besides the countenance of many men of fortune and position who, although they did not enrol themselves in its ranks, yet continued to intimate that they were ready to help in any enterprize that was vigorously undertaken and gave promise of success. Many of those who under the existing state of things are now rich in employments and honours, were at that time numbered amongst the loudest agitators of the association. Nay, those who are most virtuous in denouncing a policy of insurrection and violence, were then the most conspicuous advocates of the methods that they now reprobate and anathematize. Amongst those Farini is especially distinguished. "There are working men yet living in Bologna," says Mazzini, "who well remember Farini loudly preaching massacre in their meetings, and his habit of turning up his coat sleeves to the elbow, saying, 'My lads, we must bathe our arms in blood.'" This gentleman subsequently made himself notorious by his connection with the revolutions in Modena and Parma, where he had an opportunity of carrying out his principles, and was ultimately put into a position to repudiate them by reason of certain dealings with plate chests and wardrobes in the ducal palaces of which it fell to his lot to take possession. It may be remembered that it was this unprincipled man of blood whose book the respectable Mr. Gladstone introduced to English readers.

So fully organized and so powerful had *Young Italy* become towards the end of 1833, that it became imperative upon its leaders to bring it into action; for without action associations of this kind, when they have once received their full development, naturally tend to decay. The secret traitor works within, and the fiery effervescence of the first impulse dies away; to direct it therefore into some practical channel becomes a necessary condition of prolonged existence. This necessity of action produced the abortive invasion of Savoy in 1833—34, of which

there is an interesting account in Mr. O'Clery's pages, which will well repay study, as affording one more example of the amount of incidental shallowness and baseness that are always mixed up with such popular movements. The movement is also noteworthy for having first brought together two men whose names have since exercised so potent a spell over the minds of great masses of their fellow men, Mazzini and Garibaldi.

On the failure of the movement in 1834, Mazzini retired to Switzerland, where he remained till 1837, when he removed to England. The interval between 1837 and 1848 was occupied in plotting, writing, and organizing, and it was allotted to the latter year to bring him for a time to the surface and place him in the open light of day during the existence of the short-lived Roman Republic. We need not follow Mr. O'Clery into his clear and interesting narrative of the various incidents of that eventful time. His pages cannot but be a boon to those who wish to gain solid information on a subject which it so much concerns Catholics accurately to know.

We propose to conclude this paper with a few observations on Mazzini's general doctrines, and on the methods by which he propagated them so successfully as to become a great power in the world, and to leave his mark on the history of his own day and influences behind him that will not fail to affect the generations yet to come.

The following form some of the items of the moral instructions imparted to the committees and directors for their guidance in dealing with the youth of Italy :

We are not only conspirators, but believers.

We aspire to be not only revolutionists ; but, so far as we may, regenerators.

Our problem is, above all things, a problem of national education. Arms and insurrection are merely the means without which, in the position of our country, it is impossible to solve that problem. But we will only use bayonets on the condition that they have ideas at their points.⁵

Mazzini, then, was no mere vulgar conspirator, relying simply on brute force. Nor is he to be confounded with the vulgar materialism which has been at once a great motive and the most general outcome of the revolutionary movements of the last century. He saw the power of ideas in the world,

⁵ *Life and Writings*, vol. i. p. 180.

and the necessity of definite intellectual principles; he saw also the absolute necessity of a firm and lively belief in such principles, and therefore inferred that the first step in his work was to supply principles and to inspire faith in his followers. Against materialism he perpetually protests, and more than once formally declares his direct antagonism to its principles.

It is in accordance with these views that in his political instructions he declares that, "the most logical party is ever the strongest. Do not be satisfied with inspiring a mere spirit of rebellion in your followers, nor an uncertain indefinite declaration of Liberalism. Ask of each man in what he believes, and only accept as members those whose convictions are the same as our own. Put your trust not so much in the number, as in the unity of your forces."⁶ Belief then was indispensable; but what was to be believed?

Mazzini rejected Christianity, not only in rejecting the Church which is Christianity in action, but Christianity in any shape and way as a Divine Religion. A new faith must therefore be excogitated to meet present needs. The general principles of this new faith are given in the General Principles with which the initiators of *Young Europe* were supplied. Of these the following form the foundation:

One sole God.

One sole Ruler—His Law.

One sole interpreter of that Law—Humanity.

The meaning of this formula is thus explained. "The school which it was my object to form (and of which *Young Europe* was the germ) by the very first words of its general instructions: *One sole God; one sole ruler—His Law; one sole interpreter of His Law—Humanity*; rejected every doctrine of internal, immediate, and final revelation. It substituted for these the doctrine of the slow, continuous, indefinite revelation of the providential design, through the collective life of humanity. It deliberately rejected the idea of any intermediate source of truth between man and God, other than genius united with virtue; and of every power owing its existence to any pretended right divine, whether monarch or pope."⁷ In reliance on these principles it was that Mazzini aspired to lead the democracy, as he says, to abandon the mere materialistic spirit of rebellion that denies and destroys, but is unable to build up, in order

⁶ *Life and Writings*, vol. ii. p. 30.

⁷ *Ibid.* p. 37.

to assume the character of a positive, organic, religious mission ; seeking to substitute a true and freely accepted authority for the false authorities now ruling Europe."

We pause here, because it would be beside our present intention to enter into any discussion of the detailed conclusions deduced from these fundamental principles, or to dwell upon that which it was hoped would practically result from their application ; the association of Humanity—whatever that may mean—in a Republican Confederation, governed and directed by a common declaration of principles and a common pact, towards the common aim—the discovery and fulfilment of the universal moral law."⁸

It is sufficient for our present purpose to point out, though so plain is the significance of the above words on the very face of them that to do so is supererogatory, that Mazzini meant a religious movement and not a political movement only ; or to speak more accurately that he recognized the great principle that there can be no true politics that have not a religious basis, and accordingly set himself to construct such a basis as might serve for the future political organization of the world. Christianity in any shape or form could no longer be regarded as furnishing the required foundation. That is distinctly set aside, for claiming to be a definite internal and final revelation, it could have no place in a system where any revelation of the kind is explicitly excluded.

It is true the proposed substitute for Christianity when it comes to be examined is found to be of the slenderest kind. God is acknowledged, but is deprived of all active influence in the march of Humanity, when Humanity, if so be that it is His creation, once leaves His hands. He is not even suffered to declare the law of His own nature as the moral law best fitted for man ; the law by which man is finally to regulate himself is not to be intimated in any explicit manner by God Himself, but to be the outcome of the action of Humanity itself. That is to say, whatever Humanity—whatever that may mean—at any given time declares to be the law of God, that is to be accepted as the law, and nothing else. Practically therefore, and proximately, Humanity is the lawgiver, and not God ; so that the ultimate issue in the concrete world must be that what the State says, that is truth and that is law, and no reclamation to the contrary can be entertained. The upshot then of Mazzini's

⁸ *Life and Writings*, p. 34.

system finally comes to this: the omnipotence of the State in all matters, and the exclusion of God from His own world.

Here then we may well ask, Was this the system that the abettors of Revolution wished to favour in the support they gave so lavishly to Mazzini? at least, if not so directly to Mazzini himself, at least to his vulgar tool, Garibaldi? Were these the principles that the shouting and frantic thousands wished to hail when Garibaldi visited London in 1864, or that the leaders of English social and political life wished to sanction when they demeaned themselves to bow down before him? Not to mention those that have since passed away, the names may be recalled of men that are yet conspicuous amongst us who in various ways committed themselves to that great demonstration; of the Duke of Argyll, Lord Russell, Lord Acton, Lord Granville, the Duke of Sutherland, and Mr. Gladstone. Did these men by the countenance they then afforded to that now exploded adventurer, mean to signify their acceptance of the principles and programme that have been laid before our readers? Or with much more significance might the same question be asked in respect of men who have always put themselves forward as the leaders of the Protestant religious world, and been accepted by the public as such; men like Lord Shaftesbury, Lord Ebury, and Mr. Kinnaid, and the Protestant Bishops who allied themselves with them on that occasion. Are these principles, it may well be asked of them, compatible with the Gospel to which you so loudly proclaim your adherence? Are these the principles that you wish in any way to countenance and to further?

If then those eminent persons did not wish, and it is not to be supposed that they did wish, to accept the doctrines that lay at the root of Mazzini's movements, they stand convicted on one of two impeachments. Either they knew the nature of these doctrines, or they did not. If they knew them, then they stooped to connive at them for purposes of their own, purposes sufficiently patent to need no explanation; if they were ignorant of them, they were on a level with the mob with whom they fraternized, and thus presented the spectacle of the blind leading the blind into whatever ditch might first lie open to receive them. No issue is possible for the fashionable leaders of English social, political, and religious life, who on the occasion referred to made a show of themselves before the eyes of Europe, that does not reflect upon them discredit and disgrace.

For it is almost equally discreditable for men calling themselves statesmen, or setting themselves up before the world as religious leaders, to mislead the ignorant by the use of equivocal party war-cries, they themselves having knowledge; as, being themselves ignorant, to lead the masses whom they pretend to guide along the untried ways of disorder and revolution. Woe to the people amongst whom such a process is possible.

It was plainly then no mere matter of vulgar revolution that Mazzini was engaged in; no mere matter of pulling down Governments and regenerating humanity by means of paper constitutions bristling with the latest platitudes of Liberalism: Mazzini's aspirations soared in far loftier flight. It was question of the restoration of a decaying world by the infusion of a new faith, which was to sweep away or absorb into itself the old decrepit forms of belief that were fading away in helpless atrophy, and to mould the whole of the human race into fresher and higher forms of life. The masses, gradually penetrated by the new doctrines, were to be the instruments of this great renovation, working through energetic nationalities, and thus leading up to the grand republican federation of the world. *Young Italy*, *Young Poland*, *Young Germany*, had been formed to inaugurate the work of their several nationalities, and to these *Young Switzerland* was subsequently added. But a further step was needed to combine the action of the separate nationalities. Accordingly on April 15, 1834, *Young Europe* was formed, of which Mazzini says, "The ideal of the association of *Young Europe* was the federal organization of European democracy under one sole direction; so that any nation arising in insurrection should at once find the others ready to assist it—if not by action, at least by a moral support sufficiently powerful to prevent hostile intervention on the part of the Governments. We therefore decided to constitute a national committee of each nation, around which all the elements of republican progress might rally by degrees, and arranged that all these committees should be linked with our Central Provisional Committee of the association, through the medium of a regular correspondence." Such was the machinery to accomplish the end proposed: national associations working together in harmony "to constitute humanity in such wise as to enable it throughout a continuous progress to discover and apply the law of God by which it should be governed as speedily as possible."

One point connected with Mazzini's secret societies seems to

call for a short digression. It is the theory of the dagger. Various accusations have been launched against Mazzini on the score of the employment of assassination in furtherance of his schemes; and copies of the rules of Young Italy have been published in which the punishment of death is assigned to those who prove false to the association. Mazzini in his writings always persistently denies the existence of any such provision in his code, and would fain also clear himself of the charge of countenancing assassination in certain cases; but we must say that he fails to establish his innocence. In his letter addressed to Charles Albert on ascending the throne of Sardinia, Mazzini had committed himself to the words of menace. "Blood calls for blood, and the dagger of a conspirator is never so terrible as when it is sharpened on the tombstone of a martyr." On the other hand, during the discussion that followed the Stansfeld incident in 1864, when a Minister of the British Crown was convicted of making his house the *poste restante* of all the political conspirators on the Continent acting in union with Mazzini, the latter attempted to shield himself from the charge of assassination by declaring that the use of the only dagger he had ever counselled was the moral dagger. But the evidence against him from his own words is too strong to admit of the evasion. It may be true, as he asserts, that the use of the physical dagger formed no part of his ordinary insurrectionary proceedings; but that he finally sanctioned Gallenga's project to assassinate Charles Albert, whatever coyness or reluctance he may have shown when the proposal was first made to him, cannot for a moment be denied. Mazzini represents himself as in the end yielding to Gallenga's enthusiasm, and being persuaded that he was "one of those beings whom, from the days of Harmodius to our own, Providence has sent amongst us to teach tyrants that their fate is in the hands of a single man." Not only a thousand francs and a passport were provided for Gallenga, but the famous "little dagger with a lapis-lazuli handle," very dear to Mazzini, was put into his hands for the fatal blow. But Gallenga was not a Harmodius after all; his courage failed him at the last moment, and he has since been more safely occupied in dealing forth high politics and moralities from the columns of the *Times*.

When Mazzini's apostolate was once organized, its operations were pushed on with wonderful zeal and vigour. The press was one great engine of the propaganda. About a dozen

men, "alone, without office, without subalterns, immersed in labour the whole of the day, and the greater part of the night; writing articles and letters, seeing travellers, affiliating the Italian sailors, folding our printed articles, tying up bundles, alternating between intellectual labour and the routine of working men; it was thus that the work was done, the workers often being reduced to the extreme of poverty, but always cheerful with the smile of faith in the future upon their lips."

Italy was soon flooded with the papers thus produced. A thousand artifices were adopted to defeat the vigilance of the police and to spread their writings far and wide. Barrels of pitch and of pumice stone were converted into messengers of the apostles of the coming time. No difficulties could check the energy or daunt the courage of these earnest men. When the supply of papers proved quite inadequate to the demand, clandestine presses were set up in Italy to multiply them and to issue short publications as local circumstances gave occasion. Well may Mazzini sound a note of triumph over the first fruits of his work. In less than one year Young Italy had become the dominant association in the country, concentrated against it the alarmed persecution of seven governments, and made the whole land vibrate with the throes of coming convulsion.

It is needless to say that in all this restless movement Mazzini himself was the master spirit. "Then began for me," he says, "the life I have led for twenty years out of thirty—a life of voluntary imprisonment within the four walls of a little room;" a life, in fact, of continued and active conspiracy, during which his pen was incessantly at work, throwing off those rhapsodical productions that seem to have had such a spell for the youth of Italy. For rhapsodical and empty they were, notwithstanding some exceptional bursts of noble sentiment. There is much hazy talk, conceived for the most part in terms of generality and vague abstraction. Rarely does the reader come across anything like a definite and concrete plan; or any definite statement of practical politics; and this gives his writings a peculiar fluffiness, like that of the great rolls of mist that lurk in the hollows of the Scotch hills on an autumn day. He has, it is true, a scheme for the development of the national movement by fashioning and moulding the three great families of Europe, the Hellenic-Latin, the German and the Slavonian into instruments for his purpose, an idea that has not been without its influence in the world; but besides this, and the recognition of the importance of the

communal element in the government of a nation, there is nothing to show that he would have been capable of grappling with the daily problems that beset the path of the ruler. On the contrary, the ignorance displayed in his works on the most elementary principles of history and of ethics, would fairly indicate his unfitness for the task. As to the Christian religion and the Catholic Church which he repudiated and would have abolished, like so many of the would be great philosophical reformers of our day, he had evidently never made them the subject of serious thought and study. Brought up in a family infected with the principles of the French Revolution, his educational training was plainly of a nature to give him an antagonistic bias against the Christian revelation, which unfortunately there was nothing in his subsequent career calculated to remove.

But enough has been said as far as the object of this paper is concerned. It has been sought to present a meagre skeleton of Mazzini's system, and so to enable Catholic readers to form some estimate of his position relatively both to themselves and to the world at large. And not only that, but to furnish them with some data for forming a judgment upon those who have, whether in knowledge or in ignorance aided and abetted his designs. To do so comes with the obligation of a solemn duty upon Catholics and Christians, for a thousand indications go to prove that in many things Mazzini's influence is yet a living power in the world. The consideration therefore of what he was and what he taught, is not a thing that can be disregarded by those who have any desire to help at all in facing, and that with a view to remedying, the evils of the times.

There is one other point also that may well furnish a fruitful lesson; the example of Mazzini and of those who abandoned themselves to his influence in their resolute and unreserved devotion to their evil task. Surrendering themselves to the impulses of the strong will, and to the delusions of the powerful but clouded intellect that overmastered their own, the followers of Mazzini embraced his false convictions and accepted them as the principles of their lives with a thoroughness that shrank from no sacrifice. Theirs was no half belief as long as the delusion lasted; no weakly stinted action on that belief when once adopted. They believed and they worked, and certainly produced great results—for evil—in their day. Can as much be said of those who are possessed of higher principles and a

nobler faith, the deposit of revelation comprehending that moral law, not yet to be discovered through the action of mere blind forces, but standing revealed as well in man's consciousness as in the plain and majestic utterances of the Most High, with a brightness that requires no increase, while it suffers no eclipse?

Social evils and political evils exist in the world and always have existed, and there is no gleam of hope that they will cease to exist as long as man is what he is. But if mitigation there is to be to the extent of reducing such evils to a minimum, such mitigation can only be found in the more perfect practice of the divine law, and in the more extended application to all the relations of human life, domestic, national, and international, of the principles of Jesus Christ. That law and those principles are very wide and deep, and embrace all human relations in their far extended reach. All that is wanted is men to believe in them, men to accept them without reserve, men to accept them with the fearless courage of the sons of God. Had we such men, Mazzinian systems and all kindred disordered dreams, would shrink away into the darkness from which they sprung, and the clear white light of heaven would shine over a regenerated world. But this, it is to be feared, is reserved for eternity.

T. B. P.

Mr. Mill on Theism.

ARGUMENT FOR A FIRST CAUSE.¹

IF we put before ourselves a proud and self-willed child, that when set to learn its alphabet, refuses to see in the letters anything but black marks, expressive of no sound or sense, we have there an image of Mr. Mill's mode of philosophizing about the things of this world. If we further fancy that child—when its companions have learned to read, and are poring with interest over *Alice in Wonderland* and other such juvenile lore—standing moodily alone in a corner, angry with the rest for making so much meaning out of those stupid black marks, we have caught Mr. Mill's attitude towards the science which discerns in the world the character of a Creator. Years ago, earnest men affirmed and hypocrites denied, that some of the principles advocated in the *System of Logic* were incompatible with the being of a God. Many a young student thought so, and accepted and openly professed both them and their apparent consequence. Opinions differed as to the consistency of this proceeding. There were cries of "godless philosophy," met by rejoinders of "bigotry and narrow-mindedness;" but the appellation of "godless" was repudiated by the parties to whom the philosophy belonged. Now at least they can repudiate it no longer. Their master has acknowledged it. He has shown his colours in his posthumous works, and on behalf at least of honesty, we thank him for the display.

Mr. Mill says with justice :

The evidences of a Creator are not only of several distinct kinds but of such diverse characters, that they are adapted to minds of very different descriptions, and it is hardly possible for any mind to be equally impressed by them all (p. 138).

He examines them one by one. We have here to do with the evidence of the Argument for a First Cause. He handles

¹ *Nature, the Utility of Religion, and Theism*, pp. 142—154. Second Edition.

that argument in twelve pages, of which the following is a summary, couched almost entirely in the author's own words.

Not every object, but only every event or change, derives its existence from a cause. The permanent existences in Nature, so far as we know, are not effects at all. When we say of an object, that it is produced by causes, as water by the union of hydrogen and oxygen, we mean that when it begins to exist, its beginning is the effect of a cause: but a thing's beginning to exist is not an object, it is an event. There is in every object a changeable element, according to which it begins to exist: that is its outward form and properties dependent on combination. There is likewise a permanent element, viz., the specific elementary substance or substances of which the object consists, and their inherent properties. These substances had no beginning, consequently no cause, within the range of human knowledge; though they themselves are causes or con-causes of everything that takes place. Experience does not justify our extending to the material universe itself, that is, to the apparently immutable substances which compose it, the law, that everything has its cause, grounded, as that law is, only on our observation of changeable phenomena.

The cause of every change is a prior change; a new consequent can follow from nothing but a new antecedent. If the state of facts which brings the phenomenon into existence had existed always, the effect also would have existed always. Hence it appears that the very essence of causation is incompatible with the being of a First Cause.

Though all causes have a beginning, there is in all of them that belong to the material world a permanent element which had no beginning. This element, though not sufficient of itself to cause anything, enters as a con-cause into all causation. This element is Force. Whenever a physical phenomenon is traced to its cause, that cause when analysed is found to be a certain quantum of Force, combined with certain collocations. The variety of effects results from the different amount of Force present in each case, and from the diversity of collocations. There is in nature a fixed total quantity of Force, never more and never less. All effects may be traced up to it, while it cannot be traced, by our experience, to anything beyond; its transformations alone can be so traced, and of them the cause always includes the force itself: the same quantity of force in some previous form. Considered as the primeval and universal element in all causes, the First Cause can be no other than Force.

It is said that Force itself is caused by Mind: for whereas in the phenomena of inanimate nature the force which works is always a pre-existing force, not originated, but transferred, in voluntary action alone, so it is said, do we see a commencement, an origination of motion. Hence it is inferred that all the motion in existence owed its beginning to this one cause, voluntary agency, if not that of man, then of a more powerful Being.

But the doctrine of the Conservation of Force holds good even of voluntary agency. The will does not, any more than other causes, create Force; granting that it originates motion, it has no means of doing so but by converting into that particular manifestation a portion of Force which already existed in other forms. Volition, therefore, does not answer to the idea of a First Cause, since Force must in every instance be assumed as prior to it.

It may be urged that there is within human experience no other agency but Will that is capable of originating, not indeed Force, but the transformation of Force from some other of its manifestations into that of mechanical motion: the consequence is that the argument for a Will as the originator, though not of the universe, yet of the *kosmos* or order of the universe, remains unaltered.

But the premise of this argument is false. Many other causes besides volition can create motion out of other forms of force. Instances are chemical action, electricity, heat, and even the mere presence of a gravitating body. These agencies frequently effect, not a mere passing on of mechanical motion, but a creation of it out of a force previously latent or manifesting itself in some other form. All then that volition can originate is also originated by other transforming agents. These agents must indeed have had the force they give out put into them from elsewhere, but so also must volition. Its power, as a producing cause of phenomena, comes from an external source, the chemical action of the food and air. Theism, therefore, so far as it rests on the necessity of a First Cause, has no support from experience.

But some one will object that among the facts of the universe is Mind, and that nothing can have produced Mind but Mind. The answer is, that if the mere existence of Mind requires, as a necessary antecedent, another Mind, the difficulty is not removed by going one step back; the creating mind stands as much in need of another mind to be the source of its existence as the created mind. If however the plea is, that we know as a matter of fact every existing human mind to have begun in time; that, moreover, science indicates an epoch when no human minds at all existed, and that therefore we may well suppose the first human mind to have been produced by an Eternal Mind; then we are entitled to ask where is the proof that nothing can have caused a mind except another mind? Is it that no causes can give rise to products of a more elevated kind than themselves? But that axiom is at variance with such facts as the rise of vegetables out of soil and manure.

Thus we have in the world, Change, Matter, Force, Mind. The verdict of experience is, that Change is caused only by Change; Matter and Force are uncaused; and Mind is caused by we know not what. The world does not, by its mere existence, bear witness to a God.

The first remark that I have to make about the above dissertation, is to point out in it what I venture to consider a mistaken physical theory. When I say that the theory I mean is that of the Conservation of Force, the scientific reader will be inclined to turn with contempt from these pages. I crave his indulgence, while I briefly state my reasons. That doctrine, as I understand it, makes Matter to be a wholly inactive thing; and all the effects that take place in the material world it ascribes to a vague, indeterminate being, called Force. Matter is conceived, as it were, steeped in Force, like bread soaked in oil, the two being physically distinct. Accordingly the force passes out, numerically the same, from one piece of matter to another, just as we might squeeze out the oil from the bread into wool. What is Force? A very Proteus. Sometimes it is motion; at other times it is heat; then it becomes latent, in which case one can hardly say what it is. Pantheists of this day make a god of it: it is supplanting the Absolute of the Transcendentalists, the World-soul of the Stoics, the Ether that Aristophanes joked about, the Fire of Heraclitus, the Indefinite of Anaximander. Like these and all other pantheistic conceptions, the concept of Force is devoid of clearness and precision. It is founded upon a confusion of three ideas: power, action, and effect. To beginners in Mechanics, Force is explained to be that which causes motion. This definition is tolerable, although it would be more correct to observe the distinction between power and action, and define Force as that which is apt to cause motion. But as the instruction proceeds, it is coolly laid down that one species of Force is motion: thus the effect is actually identified with the power. This confusion, which arises from a superficial view of Impact, renders the explanation of the actions of Cohesion, Resistance, and Gravitation, simply impossible. It also reduces Matter to an absurdity, representing it on the one hand as a substance, and on the other hand as devoid of any inherent active power: as though substantial existence could stand with pure passivity, or as though a substance could make itself known to us without an exercise of power over us.

I would apply an argument to remedy this confusion. Force, I say, cannot exist apart from Matter: this every one admits—consequently, Force and Matter are not physically distinct. Again, Matter is acknowledged to be a substance: therefore it must be endowed with active power in the material

order, that is, with force.² I conclude then that Force and Matter are substantially one and the same being. One and the same material substance, considered on its active side, inasmuch as it is apt to cause motion, is called force; and considered on its passive side, inasmuch as it is apt to be incited to motion, it is called matter. Further, I conclude that as there are millions upon millions of ultimate material substances in the world, so there are millions upon millions of substantially distinct forces. The one Force, pervading all nature, the idol of the physico-pantheist school, I regard as a mere abstraction, a figment of Realism, that has oddly enough been made a pet of in the Nominalist camp. At the same time, I quite agree with Mr. Mill, that it is absurd to talk of natural agents creating Force. They can no more create Force than they can create Matter: for Force is Matter, viewed in its activity. The forces, or ultimate material substances, existing at this moment throughout space, are those which God summoned into being in the beginning, when He created heaven and earth. He alone can destroy any one of them, by annihilating it; and I believe that He never will annihilate even one. I hold the Conservation, not of Force, but of Forces. Motion I regard, not as a force, or cause of motion, but as a condition under which a force acts. I own that many truths of vital practical importance—such as that of the need of not “muzzling the ox that treadeth,” or starving the man that has to work—lie at the base of the theory which I have been trying to overturn. My only desire is to see the structure pulled down, and rebuilt, calmly and warily, without any of that reckless haste that has striven to rear it, a new Tower of Babel, against the Creator.³

The bearing of the above argument against Mr. Mill is that, whereas he honours Force with the name of “First Cause,”⁴ and endows it with “all the attributes of a thing eternal and uncreated,”⁵ ground has been shown for suspecting that Force, as he understands it, is as empty and visionary a shade, as were

² A material substance is *inert*, because it cannot affect its own motion, not because it cannot affect that of other material substances.

³ The inquiry, I think, ought to be conducted upon the dynamist theory of simple elements, as proposed by Father Boscovich and amended by Father Bayma. To the work of the latter on *Molecular Mechanics* (Macmillan), I am indebted for the substance of my criticism on the so-called Conservation of Force.

⁴ P. 145.

⁵ P. 147.

Διός καὶ Αἰθέρος, "Rotation and Ether," the new gods of the rationalist school, which Aristophanes held up to the mockery of the Athenian public, almost four-and-twenty centuries ago.⁶

Passing from Mr. Mill's physics to his logic, I observe it to be of that peculiar kind which Englishmen suppose to prevail in the Sister Isle, where the Principle of Contradiction does not hold sway. Mr. Mill exhibits the following happy family of propositions.

1. Not everything which we know derives its existence from a cause, but only every event or change (p. 142).
2. The cause of every change is a prior change (p. 143).
3. The very essence of causation as it exists within the limits of our knowledge, is incompatible with a First Cause (p. 144).
4. The specific elementary substances and their inherent properties . . . are causes or con-causes of everything that takes place (p. 143).
5. Whenever a physical phenomenon is traced to its cause, that cause when analysed is found to be a certain quantum of Force, combined with certain collocations (pp. 144, 145).
6. As the primeval and universal element in all causes, the First Cause can be no other than Force (p. 145).

Now Propositions 1, 2, and 3, stand well together, and Propositions 4, 5, and 6, agree among themselves; but the two trios united are anything but in harmony. Let us consider the first three propositions. They may be stated thus: Every effect is a change, and every change is an effect; also, every cause is a change: therefore there can be no First Cause. See what will come of adding another proposition: The only reality that is, is Change. A First Cause at this rate is manifestly impossible. We have hit upon the doctrine of Heraclitus, the philosopher of Ephesus, who said, "All things are in a flux." A modern rendering of it is, The universe is nothing but phenomena, or ever-varying states of consciousness. This assertion sweeps away the substance both of Matter and Mind; it denies all permanent being; and having transmuted the world and man into a loose cloud of flickering relations, need I say, it has no reverence for the everlasting solidity of the throne of God. Heraclitus' doctrine of the flux is the most consistent form of atheism that ever was devised. But God has planted in every human breast an inextinguishable consciousness that gives Heraclitus the lie. I mean the consciousness of

⁶ Aristophanes, *Clouds*, 380.

the *Ego*, or self. When a man thinks upon himself, he has lighted upon something that abides. Times and seasons change, but I am the being that I was twenty years ago. Starting from our own personality as a fixed point, we proceed to grasp and comprehend other permanent beings both personal and impersonal.

Mr. Mill shrinks from being drawn into the Heraclitean flux. He takes his stand upon at least two abiding existences, as he considers, Matter and Force. Propositions 4, 5, and 6, amount to this: that Force, now in one collocation of elementary material substances, and now in another, is the cause of every physical phenomenon, and is in that sense the First Cause. But these assertions destroy the others that went before. For if Force is the First Cause, a First Cause cannot be incompatible with the very essence of causation; and again, if the only effect of any cause is change, and change is caused only by change, it does not appear how Force and Matter, two permanent beings, can be causes.

It is a slight matter if Mr. Mill has contradicted himself. But his contradiction of the argument for a Divine First Cause is a thing to be looked to. He assails that argument on two sides: from a consideration of the effects, and also from a consideration of the causes, that come within human experience. His first objection is virtually this: that all the effects we observe in the material world are accidental changes in the ordering of Matter; we never find an instance of the substance of Matter being produced: therefore we possess no proof that Matter itself was ever produced, or has a cause, at all.⁷ I admit both premises. As for the conclusion, I admit that we possess no proof of the causal origin of Matter within the range of physical science; but I say that we have a proof by the aid of metaphysics. Physical science has nothing whatever to do with substance, whether material or spiritual, but only with the phenomena that substance presents. Substance, both in its being and in its causation, is subject to the metaphysician. It lies out of the sphere of what can be observed by the senses, or gathered from a comparison of sensory observations, which Mr. Mill calls the sphere of experience. His objection disproves Matter just as much as it disproves God. For it might be turned this way: We can observe only the phenomena, not the

⁷ I shall say no more about Force, because, as I have endeavoured to show, Matter and Force are not physically distinct.

substance, of Matter: therefore we cannot prove the existence of material substance. Then Heraclitus was right when he taught that the world was a mere series of dissolving views. *Aut Heraclitus aut nullus*, should have been Mr. Mill's motto; or rather, *Aut Heraclitus aut fidelis*. I commend the motto to his disciples.

The proof of a First Cause, drawn by metaphysics from Matter, is very simple and convincing, when we remember that it is a metaphysical proof—in other words, that it rests not on the bare observation of external facts, but likewise on an analysis of ideas.⁸ Let us imagine ourselves on a still, hot autumn day, sitting by the side of one of our English lakes. Suddenly there comes a ripple over the water—the “dark ripple,” the theme of every poet from Homer to Tennyson. We at once make up our minds, as Mr. Mill also would have done, that there is a reason for the being of that slight change. A puff of wind has come down from the mountains. Mr. Mill would have us believe that that ripple has a reason for its being, but that the vast sheet of water before us, and the giant hills, have, for the substances that are in them, no reason to be. We answer, in the face of nature and of truth, that we neither can nor will accept such teaching. If there must be a reason for the being of an accident, much more for the being of a substance. There must then be a *reason why* for the existence of Matter. That reason will lie either in Matter itself or in some other being. If Matter has in itself the reason of its own being, Matter cannot but be: then Matter and Being, in the fullest sense of the word, are identical; but Being in its fullest sense comprehends intelligence: therefore Matter is intelligent, which is false. Therefore the reason of the being of the substance of Matter is to be sought outside of Matter. There is no use seeking it in Nature or in Man, for nowhere in that region do we find a cause adequate to the production of Substance. Moreover Substance, even Material Substance, in the last resort, is a simple unity, not the product of any putting together of physical component parts. Therefore the cause of Matter is some Being that can create substance out of pure nothing: and that is God alone.

Mr. Mill's second objection is drawn from the nature of the

⁸ Those good Christians who cry down metaphysical science, would do well to notice what Mr. Mill proves to demonstration in this Essay, that without metaphysics it is a sheer impossibility to establish the existence of God.

causes that physical science observes. To this I must be allowed to say that, properly speaking, physical science does not observe causes at all. It is conversant only about phenomena; now no phenomenon, nor any amount of them, is a cause. A cause is that which acts; and that which acts is always a substance, never a phenomenon. Physicists study, not the causes but the conditions of the sequence of phenomena. They have the authority of custom for calling these conditions causes; and no one grudges them that indulgence. But when a pseudo-philosopher gets up, and attempts to forge an argument out of a loose use of language, then it is high time to fall back upon rigid definitions, and insist on his calling a cause a cause, and a condition no more than a condition. Mr. Mill says: "The cause of every change is a prior change;" and laying that down, he argues thence, very logically, against even the possibility of a First Cause. But his premise, to be true, should have been: The condition of every change in the course of nature is a prior change. From that, the coveted conclusion would not have followed. Imagine, for an illustration, that a flood has occurred, and carried away a house. The change of the house was conditioned upon a change in the river, and that again on a change in the atmosphere, which ended in rain. But the cause that really wrought the effect upon the building was the water, which is a collection of substances. Those substances, exercising their attractive or repulsive powers, overturned the house. The substances were fraught with those powers from the first instant of creation: the change of weather and the rise of the river were but the conditions under which the causes came into play to the grief of the owner of the mansion. A material substance, being a necessary agent, is of itself ever attracting or repelling, according to the fixed law of its nature. But as it is placed in various surroundings, its operation takes effect in various ways. Conditions vary, and results vary: causes remain the same. From the fact that no change occurs in the material world except on condition of some prior change wrought there, it follows that Matter cannot have had for its First Cause any material agent that works under conditions. Mr. Mill is welcome to this conclusion. But it in no way militates against Theism. It is the prerogative of the Creator, Who brings substances out of nothing, to be hampered by no conditions, and to render His operation effectual without any antecedent change.

I can afford to pass lightly over the rest of Mr. Mill's dissertation. The difficulty which he sets up and disposes of, about Will originating Force, is a mere man of straw. His reasoning on this point does but prove that no will, acting through a body such as ours, can have created Matter—which is very obvious. The argument, that Mind may possibly have had a material origin, seeing that vegetables spring up out of soil and manure, is hardly serious.

I now present two proofs, the one from the existence of Matter, the other from the existence of Mind, which may serve to rebut Mr. Mill's assertion, that "the world does not, by its mere existence, bear witness to a God."⁹ Matter, I say, cannot exist for an instant, except under the ken of a mind, and that is the Mind of God; and again, Mind cannot exist long, except with some knowledge of truth, and that is the Truth of God. I will begin with the latter head.

It would take a long time to write out the list of true beliefs, about things great and small, that are held by a young child. Among them, in a particular instance, we will suppose, are these two:

The blood leaves the heart by the arteries, and returns by the veins.

The shortest distance between two points is a straight line.

The true belief about the circulation of the blood is a growth of yesterday in the child's mind. But the truth that is believed is much older. The question is, how old? As old as the animal race, or no older than the time of Harvey? If the truth began with Harvey's apprehension of it, we should say that Harvey invented it, arranged it, made it so. On the contrary, we say that Harvey simply discovered the truth of the circulation of the blood. If he discovered it, then it existed before. But where? Not in any human mind, for no man knew it. Perhaps it existed out of all mind. That cannot be: for by definition, truth is the correspondence of a thing to the understanding of it. *Veritas est adæquatio rei et intellectus*. If, by an impossibility, there were an understanding that understood nothing, not even its own existence, there would be no truth there. And if, by another impossibility, there were a material substance the existence of which no understanding apprehended, there again there would be no truth. Truth is of the nature of an equation, and an equation requires two

⁹ P. 153.

terms. Therefore the truth of the circulation of the blood existed in some Mind, other than human, before Harvey knew of it. It cannot be supposed to have been lost to that Mind by Harvey's discovery. There the truth is stored, and has been at least ever since the first vertebrate animal came to live. Was it there before?

A proposition may be true in two ways, either in point of accomplished fact or in point of being about to be accomplished. In the former way, it is true that the spire of Antwerp Cathedral is four hundred and sixty-six feet high. In the latter way, before a stone of the building was laid, a person contemplating the plan, might have said with truth, The height of this spire is four hundred and sixty-six feet. The circulation of the blood was evidently not true, as an accomplished fact, before there were any animals. Was it true as a fact of the future? Suppose that, in some whimsical manner, the sentence had become graven on a rock, in the days when there were rocks but no animal life upon earth. Suppose it, I say, written in Hebrew, Greek, Latin, or any other character or language, as follows: The blood leaves the heart by the arteries, and returns by the veins. Would that inscription have conveyed a truth of the future to any primeval intelligence that might have been able to decipher it? Undoubtedly it would. Yet that reading would not have made the truth, any more than our reading of a newspaper makes the truths, if any such there happen to be, recorded in those columns. The truth then about the circulation of blood that was to be, existed independently of any reading of inscriptions, before there was any blood to circulate. That is, it existed from all eternity. And being a truth, it must have existed in some mind. Therefore there is an Eternal Mind, the ever-watchful Custodian of Truth.

The second piece of information that we drew from our little child, to the effect that the shortest distance between two points is a straight line, has always been possessed by man. But the truth of the axiom did not begin with man. It is a truth that must be. If the universe were swept away, with all the points that it contains, and all the lines that they in their motion describe, it would remain just as true as it is now, that whenever and wherever two points are marked, a straight line is the shortest distance between them. This truth is eternal. Therefore it must be kept in an Eternal Mind.

There are infinite number of truths, some like the first, and

others like the second of those that I have instanced. Therefore there must be an Infinite Mind to enshrine them all. That Mind is God.

The existence of God being proved from the existence of Mind, the proof of it from the existence of Matter follows at once. For Matter cannot exist, unless it truly exist: but it cannot truly exist, unless it be apprehended by Mind, seeing there is no truth apart from Mind: therefore a condition of the existence of Matter is, that Mind should apprehend it; but Matter can exist very well without being apprehended by me or by any other finite intelligence: therefore the existence of Matter is conditioned upon its being apprehended by an Infinite Intelligence. The only premise in this argument that can be questioned, is the last one. Questioned accordingly it is by Positivists and Pantheists of every hue. I shall not reply to their cavillings here. If a man really thinks that nothing exists anywhere without his being there to see, he has reached a stage beyond argument. Mr. Mill, however, in the pages that I am reviewing, seems to assume two noumena, Matter and Force, independent of human perception.

To escape the force of arguments, such as those that I have been advancing, godless philosophers have denied that there is such a thing as truth, distinct from human opinion; they have resolved Matter into mere phenomena, and Mind into an impersonal series of conscious states; they have declared Existence "a fictitious predicate," "a mere name;" they have, so far as in them lay, unmade the world by their philosophy—in order that the world might not, "by its mere existence, bear witness to a God."

There is just one truth, of practical importance, that may be culled from Mr. Mill's pages. It relates to the position that should be given to the physical sciences in the forming of the mind. It is admitted on all hands, that a man may read too much poetry, or too much mathematics; and the cry has gone up to the clouds, that there has been too much reading of Latin and Greek; why should physical science alone be privileged, that it should be studied without a corrective? Are there not depths of truth and beauty, things of unspeakable interest to man, over and above phenomena and the laws of phenomena? What though sensible experience cannot take in such things, is physical science therefore competent to proclaim their non-existence? Is sense the only faculty? is it even the ruling

faculty, in man? If not, the professor of physics should not claim to have all questions tried in his court, and decided according to his law. A poetical solution of a geometrical problem, or a metaphysical way of doing Bills of Parcels, would betray an ignorance of the scope and nature of arithmetic and geometry. What then is to be thought of the attempt to treat theology from the stand-point of the physicist? What of the wrong-headed inquirers who go about, as Mr. Mill has done, to try whether there is a God or not, by the same methods which they would use to test for lead in a chemical analysis?

The Church is not afraid of physical science; she looks to science to be her handmaid. The following are the words of a man, who was full to overflowing of the spirit of Christ and His Church, the late Father Faber:

It seems as if the physical sciences were the natural allies of theology, and a profound study of them an essential part of a theological education. . . . Perhaps it would not be rash even to prophesy that the fresh start and new development of the mental sciences, to which we must all be anxiously looking forward, are waiting for the further advance of certain of the physical sciences, in whose future discoveries mental science will find another starting-point. . . . The vast circuit and wide expansion of scientific discovery is an augury of a yet more magnificent theology, one which will enable us to envy less those scholastic glories in whose sunset we are living."¹⁰

A mind that has felt the difficulties of metaphysics and theology, and has marked how the greatest masters in both have been foiled by the defective state of physics at the time when they wrote, will heartily respond to this sentiment. What one must deprecate is the one-sidedness that is produced by studying physical science to the neglect of literature, formal logic, psychology, and Christian doctrine. The cry for physical science, in the mouths of some men, means more than it sounds. They wish to produce one-sidedness, that the mind may be biassed against God. Christian educators should be awake to this danger.

J. R.

¹⁰ *Bethlehem*, c. vi.

Freemasonry.

COMMUNICATED.¹

I.

ENGLISH AND FOREIGN—ITS HISTORY IN ENGLAND—ITS RELATION TO OTHER SECRET SOCIETIES—CONSIDERED AS A RELIGIOUS SYSTEM—MASONRY AND CHRISTIANITY—AIMS AND OBJECTS—POLITICAL AND RELIGIOUS CREEDS OF ITS MEMBERS—ITS ORIGIN—ITS GROWTH—ITS DEVELOPMENT.

As long as Freemasonry in England is, apparently, only an extensive Benefit Society, patronised by princes, and highly advantageous to publicans, so long will the Craft in these realms be comparatively harmless socially, and comparatively powerless politically.²

English Freemasons, though numbering among their body persons of the highest distinction and of recognized official position, are only tolerated by the Government of this country, which reserves to itself the power of suppressing the Masonic Society at any moment when such interference may appear advisable. Curiously enough, by the existing statutes (one concerning the illegality of secret oaths, and another directed against the religious orders of the Catholic Church) the Freemasons and the Jesuits are, to a certain extent, on a parallel footing in the United Kingdom, and exist among us on sufferance. The traditional Protestant dread of the great Society founded by Ignatius Loyola, is sufficient to account for the legal provisions deemed necessary in preserving the British Constitution against the supposed insidious plots of this purely religious Order, while the historical evidence of the revolutionary principles and communistic outbreaks of continental Freemasons is quite sufficient—letting alone the indefensible character of secret oaths—to warrant any Government in its passive attitude of supervision over a body of men acknowledging, and even boasting

¹ This article comes to us from a source which is a guarantee for its authenticity. It is written, as will be seen, from an Anglican rather than a Catholic point of view. But it has been refused insertion in more than one Protestant organ of influence, on account, we may fairly presume, of its candid witness about the tendency of Freemasonry.

² "*Politically powerless.*" While the writer was revising the proofs of this article, he fell in with an Irish ex-M.P., who was about to undertake an important duty on the occasion of some grand Masonic ceremonial. He owned that since his Oxford undergraduate days he had for years given up Masonry, but had taken it up again in view of the next election; "when," he added, "it would be immensely useful."

of, its brotherhood with those whose cry of "Liberty, Equality, Fraternity" has been the watchword of the most sanguinary rebellions against all established authority. I am not denying that English Freemasons have, as a body, invariably evinced their disgust at the conduct of their brethren in France, in Germany, and in Italy, who, however, sneer at their English brethren as merely playing at Masonry, and as pleased with their ribands, jewels, and aprons, as are children with toys.³

The fact is that it is almost impossible for English Freemasons of the present day to be, as a body, disloyal, or to abuse the liberty allowed them, as long as Royalty provides its Grand Master, the aristocracy and the snobocracy (a tremendous element in English Masonry) its officials, the Established Church its chaplains, and the publicans, hotel-keepers, and licensed victuallers, its temples of worship.

The tendency of "Free-gilds" in this country has never been towards disloyalty; they have, on the contrary, supported authority by authority, and their existence has been, it is needless to say, of the greatest possible value to all trade interests.⁴ Practical masons from all countries came into England in Henry the Third's time, much as foreign professors do now-a-days; and, for their own protection against native jealousy, were soon formed into a "free-gild," under royal patronage. These, enlisted among their English fellow-craftsmen, were the architects and builders of our Gothic churches, the glory of mediæval England. "Speculative Masons" had, at that time, no recognised existence as a secret society, external and necessarily antagonistic to the Church. On the contrary, masons were, apparently, her obedient children engaged on a great work; yet, among them were, in all probability, individuals of Jewish descent, foreigners from the East, tainted with the widespread heresy of the Gnostics, and skilled in the practice of magic. This spark was fanned into a flame by the breath of the great rebellion against the authority of the Church, when, in the confusion of opinions, our forefathers looked about to find some place of rest, and, at last, weary of conflict, they, with national caution, chose a compromise in religious matters, leaving the issue to the judgment of time. Then, separating themselves from the fellowship of Catholic Masons, the Jews, infidels, foreigners, and professors of the new opinions, held a masonic lodge at York, traditionally the

³ "They [the French Masons] said that the English were ignorant of true Masonry, and possessed nothing but the introduction to it; and even this was not understood by them."—Robison's *Proofs of a Conspiracy*, &c. Second edition. 1797.

⁴ Under Athelstan, the Masons formed themselves into a guild among the other "free-gilds" of that time. These are not to be confounded with what we know now-a-days as "Freemasons;" they were operative masons. The first lodge is said to have borne in mind that the Craft-Guild of Masons would be employed by all other guilds in the erection of town-halls, of churches, chantries, and chapels; for each guild acknowledged some special patron or saint, and possessed a fund set apart for pious uses.—Vide Smith's *History of the English People*.

birth-place of English masonry. Queen Bess, as jealous as her father of any other claim to authority than her own, whether spiritual or temporal, and who would have unaproned a Freemason as willingly as she would have unfrocked one of her own home-made bishops, sent an armed troop to dissolve this assembly; and dissolved it would have been, and subjected to pains and penalties into the bargain, had not Elizabeth clearly understood, from the very men whom she had commissioned to interfere, that there was nothing, in the principles or practices of the Masons, contrary to Her Majesty's supreme authority; and, in short, her own officers, who had been initiated into such mysteries of the craft as then existed, told her all they knew of the matter, and the great Protestant Queen accorded the small body of Masons her special patronage.

Leaving for the present the history of the gradual growth and development of modern "Speculative Masonry," I purpose briefly entering upon what has always seemed to me a most important question as affecting the morality of its first principles, viz., its origin.

Freemasonry came to be the crystallization of all previously existing secret societies. Putting aside, as a mere accident of its existence in England, its convivial aspect, Freemasonry must be considered as a system of morality teaching by symbolism, "catholic" in its aim as being tolerant of *all* error, except the absolute and explicit denial of the existence of a Supreme Being. The "fool who hath said in his heart there is no God," cannot be a Freemason, without, indeed, making greater fools than himself of the Masons, who might admit him into their society. But as there are, and notoriously have been, avowed atheists who are, and were, undeniably Freemasons, it may be supposed that a sense of honour, and a recognition of the obligations of a vow, or of the inconvenient consequences of breaking a promise made to a powerful body of men, are to be taken as a sufficient qualification for masonic membership.⁵ As to the subjective view of the matter taken by the atheistical Mason himself, that is a matter for *his* consideration: but it is reasonable to suppose, that, while such a man despises all religious forms and ceremonies, he would feel himself bound by a sense of conventional "honour" to conform to the customs of any society, of which he had, voluntarily, become a member. All religious creeds and worship, and even their negation, are acknowledged by

⁵ *The Duc de Chartres*, afterwards *Orléans* and *Égalité*, was Grand Orient of France. The Abbé Sieyès held office in the Lodge of *Philalethes* at Paris, and also at Lyons. Diderot, Voltaire, Defrésmenil (of the *Amis Réunis* at Paris), Mirabeau, who, with the Duc de Lauzun and the Abbé Perigord, afterwards Bishop of Autun, reformed a lodge of *Philalethes*. The unfortunate Philip Égalité was only a tool in the hands of others, and the dupe of his own ambition; but his example is a warning to all who see nothing incompatible in the principles of constitutional monarchy with those of communistic Masonry. Orléans, as Mirabeau hinted, was, at the early stage of his Masonic career, only half illuminated. "The fellow carries a loaded pistol in his bosom," said Mirabeau of him, "but will never dare to pull the trigger."—See also the story of "*La Veuve retirée*," mentioned in Robison's *Proofs of a Conspiracy*.

Freemasonry as equally right, or rather, equally wrong, as being only human external expressions of the one true interior worship of the Divine Intelligence, whom Freemasonry styles "the Supreme Architect of the Universe." Now both pantheists and atheists would probably see in this only a convenient form of expressing the Collective Human Intellect, a sort of *mortal* soul pervading and energising through the human race. This view, equally wrong with the others, the Mason would consider sufficient for the requirements of Masonry. It is no wonder then, that, without any promulgation of anathema, the Catholic Church sees in the principle of Freemasonry a gigantic antagonist. The principle of Masonry is *ipso facto* excommunicate. Masonry welcomes within its pale Truth and Error, regarding both alike; the Church asserts herself the divinely-appointed infallible judge of what is truth and what is error, and pronounces that the agreement of the two together, and within one pale, is as impossible as the co-existence simultaneously of light and darkness. The Church says, what is truth is divine, what is error is diabolical. Freemasonry denies the latter *in toto*, and only admits the former, by confounding what the Church stigmatises as error with what the same Church has declared to be truth. Now, seeing that *practical* Masonry was not originally a system on which these opinions were chargeable, how came this to be the distinctive teaching of *speculative* Freemasonry? for, vague as is the instruction, this is the distinctive teaching of Freemasonry, and this is the only secret that Freemasonry possesses, *i.e.*, the secret of the worship of the Supreme Architect; and "the secret" of this worship is the ultimate "worship of Reason," which we have, alas! seen to consist in anarchy and confusion under the title of "Liberty, Equality, Fraternity." To this all the secret rites are subservient; to this end they all lead.

All this must sound strange in the ears of those sociable spirits who, in England, only become Masons for the sake of its convivialities, and to those respectable citizens who represent to their wives that their attendance at lodge is a duty from which they cannot possibly be excused.

This *par parenthèse*.

It is necessary to dismiss, for a while, our present idea of Freemasonry, in order to get at the origin of its principles.

Their peculiar rites and ceremonies did not spring into existence at once. They are the growth of centuries, just as are the laws and customs of civilized communities.

Briefly, when every art or trade bound its professors and disciples in what was in subsequent mediæval times called "a guild," or "gild," each confraternity possessed its signs and tokens. Oral instruction, it is needless to say, was before writing; and closely connected with it was the system of symbolism. Masons soon became one of the most important of the confraternities. Individuals of various nationalities banded together, and travelled over Europe, subsisting by their archi-

tectural art and their manual labour. Masters were at the head of these "gangs," much as now a superior is the responsible captain of a gang of navvies; and, indeed, the English workmen engaged on foreign railroads, the Dutch engaged in building, and the Germans in watch-making in this country, are illustrations of the early stage of the existence of the masonic crafts. Differing from one another in language, and—rarely at first—in creeds, it was necessary for them to be united by signs and tokens, intelligible to, and recognized by, all. These, once settled, would serve them as guarantees of their proficiency in their craft, and as introductions to foreigners, where verbal explanations in their own native tongue would have been useless. Thus the aim of the builders, for their own benefit and for that of society at large, was to establish a universal organization which should in time be substituted for that union, which had existed among masons previous to their dispersion at Babel. For it is not to the modern legend of Hiram Abiff that masons should go for their lost signs and tokens, but to the time anterior to the greatest meeting of Masons the world has ever seen, when, united in purpose and in speech, and as if impiously electing for their Grand Master the fallen leader of the rebel angels, they, under the banner of Liberty, Equality, and Fraternity, set themselves to achieve the independence of the human race, by defying the Divine Authority. "Ambition—by that sin fell" the first masons, whose Grand Lodge was awfully dissolved by the fiat of the Supreme Architect Himself.

Babel was destroyed, and the builders became wanderers over the face of the earth. With them they took their implements; and of the glories of their past history, all that survived the ruin were vague reminiscences of a symbolism, the true meaning of which only a few among them knew. But these signs became subsequently, as it were, rallying centres, and served as the foundation of unity, when they had no longer a common language, or a common worship. Of course I am but putting forward a theory to account for the fact that foreign builders coming from one quarter of the globe to another, did actually find other builders, separated from them by language and by creed, possessing a knowledge of the signs and tokens they brought with them.

That this idea of re-union would not have originated with the Jews is evident from the exclusive character of their religion. Until the Christian era, the Pagans, with their secret rites and symbols, stood apart from one another, finding occasional links, it is true; and the Jews from all—even from the Persians, who had borrowed so much from them, and incorporated their knowledge, so obtained, into their own religious tenets.

Then, within the great Roman Empire sprang up a new Secret Society, contemptuously styled by the Emperor Julian "The Galileans," whose aim was the spiritual freedom of the human race; its freedom, that is, under Divine Authority, but not as at Babel, its independence of it. It was introduced by signs and wonders. Jew and Pagan dreaded its growth, and though at first the Pagan confounded Jew

and Christian together, yet, gradually Jew and Pagan united to crush the new secret society, whose life they instinctively felt was fatal to their own religious existence.

The commencement of Gnosticism was the era of the birth of an antichristian secret society, whose aim was a catholicity which should rival that of the Christian Church. Its terms of membership were far easier than those demanded by the Christians.

The Christian brotherhood had their own signs and ceremonies, their own secrets, their catechumens, and their initiated.

The Gnostic brotherhood determined upon the adoption of so close an imitation of these as might possibly deceive the orthodox fraternity.

These signs were communicated by the renegade Christians to the Jews and Pagans, who became members of the Gnostic society.

Gnosticism, associated with the practice of "the black art," rapidly spread. It travelled from east to west; it became probably, one of the causes of the decay of the Knights Templars.

In this antichristian secret society were naturally men of all trades and arts. Such among them as were builders joined themselves to travelling bands, as before mentioned, and, finding the expression of their opinions inconvenient, adopted the external religious profession of the majority, except in those instances already mentioned, where, as *e.g.*, in the case of Jewish masons, they were temporarily protected by royal, or municipal authority.

Such was the growth of Masonry until the Reformation afforded it an opportunity of accepting the shelter of a Masonic temple, where all differences of religious creeds would be absorbed into the one common worship of the Supreme Architect. It was not, however, till the eighteenth century that its present traditions were finally adopted, and its rites and ceremonies authoritatively fixed.

II.

THE MASONIC TOKENS AND SIGNS—GNOSTICISM AND CHRISTIANITY IN CONFLICT—IMITATION—CHRISTIAN SIGNS—GNOSTIC APPROPRIATION—MASONIC RETENTION IN MUTILATED FORM—IDENTITY OF A CERTAIN SIGN—CATHOLIC, GREEK, AND MASONIC RITES—FURTHER COMPARISON—INITIATION—RECEPTION AND ADULT BAPTISM—ON ENGLISH CLERGYMEN AS MASONS—AGAINST THE EIGHTEENTH ARTICLE—OF THE MENTION OF A SACRED NAME—THE FIRST OATH AND SOME DETAILS AS TO THE CEREMONIES OF INITIATION—THE SECOND OATH—THE IMPOSSIBILITY OF PLAYING AT MASONRY.

Of Masonic Tokens and Signs.—These tokens were originally the shapes of the implements in common use; and the original signs were made by placing hands and feet in imitation of those shapes. But Gnosticism, as I have said, introduced new signs and imitated those of the Christian Church.

Now the most ancient Christian sign is that of the Cross. The first Christians made this sign at all hours of the day, and on all occasions.

By this sign, as Tertullian witnesses, they recognized one another. This sign the Gnostic renegades imitated, and the imitation which has been handed down, and which is now practised by Masons, is exactly what an imitation would degenerate into, which had itself been learned from imitators. The Christian sign was, and is, made with the right hand touching the forehead first, then the breast, then the left shoulder, and then the right. The imitation omits the two first movements, and only imitates the latter in such a way as to illustrate the penalty of the entered Apprentice's oath, of which I shall treat presently. But a still closer imitation of the original will be found in the ceremony observed by Masons at their official banquets, which are themselves, probably, the continuance of Gnostic Lovefeasts, in imitation, and in ridicule of the Christian *agapæ*.

The Masonic sign made on such occasions with the wine-glass (in response to a proposed toast), is precisely the same as that made by the celebrant at Mass when he moves (according to the most ancient rite, and as still practised in the Roman Catholic and the Greek Church) the chalice from north to south, and from east to west, in the form of a cross.

The Mason, when drinking a Masonic toast says, "Point, left, right; point, left, right," moving his glass in front of him northwards, then to the right—that is, in the form of a cross.

Of course most English Freemasons are ignorant of this practice in Western and Eastern ritual, which I take to be the origin of this convivial rite.

Freemasonry has developed its ceremonies, in imitation of ancient Christian ceremonies, as is easily seen by a comparison of the admission of an Apprentice Mason, with the ceremonies of Baptism, *i.e.*, of admission into the Catholic Church. The one will be found in any manual of Freemasonry; the other, concerning the most primitive form of admitting a catechumen, in a Catholic prayer-book. The candidate (of course I speak of adult baptism, the rule of the primitive Church) stands without; is asked what he seeks; is led into the church. In Freemasonry, the candidate (who is blindfolded, his breast bared, and a cable tow placed round his neck, while a "Brother" holds the point of a sword to his breast) stands without, is led into the Lodge, and is asked what he seeks. It is worthy of remark that in the Christian ceremonial the candidate has his eyes open, but in the Masonic ritual he is blindfolded.

And here I must pause to express my astonishment that any clergyman of the Established Church can think an official position in the Masonic body, or, indeed, being a Mason at all, compatible with his allegiance to his own communion. Freemasonry, by admitting members of all creeds to its privileges, and by its teaching concerning the Supreme Architect, to Whom alone its prayers in open lodge are addressed, implicitly, and explicitly, sets forth its principle of union to be, that every man can be saved by the religion he professes, which is in direct

contravention of the 18th Article of the English Church ; which article, moreover, asserts the exclusive condition of salvation to be Christianity. But, as a Mahommedan, or a Jew, or a Brahmin must leave Mahomet, Moses, and Brahma outside the lodge door when he enters the Masonic temple as a Mason, so a Christian must leave behind him the name of his Saviour ; for it is *unmasonic* to mention His name even in a grace said by a Masonic chaplain at a banquet of the brotherhood, much more to pray in His name in a lodge. How any Christian clergymen can reconcile this negation to their consciences is a marvel to me ; but the case is so, and they know that the New Testament is ignored in the Masonic lodge, where only the Old Testament lies open, the brotherhood considering this "the most Masonic book in the world," whose teaching is to be symbolically interpreted.⁶

The Oaths.—Ladies are curious to know something of the secrets of Masonry. They can read it for themselves in a Masonic manual. They are aware that, periodically, their husbands, fathers, and brothers attend a lodge, and then meet "to transact business" and dine, or sup. With what light hearts must the entered apprentices sit down to their love-feast who have just bound themselves by the tremendous obligation, which is prefaced by the following remarks and questions—

The Worshipful Master (addressing the blindfolded and helpless candidate). "It is my duty to inform you that Masonry is free" (*this is sarcastic, considering the position of the novice*), "and requires a perfect freedom of inclination in every candidate for its mysteries. It is founded on the purest principles of piety and virtue"—let this be remembered when the oath comes. "It possesses great and invaluable privileges for worthy men, and, I trust, for the worthy alone. Vows of fidelity are required : but let me assure you that in those vows there is nothing incompatible with your civil, moral, or religious duties"—which must be consoling to the candidate at this point. "Are you, therefore, willing to take a solemn obligation, founded on the principles I have stated, to keep inviolate the secrets and mysteries of the order?"

Candidate. "I am."

⁶ "It is plainly apparent that doctrines such as these are fraught with much danger to the beliefs of Protestantism. On account of this, the Protestant Consistory in Hanover was only acting in self-defence when, in the year 1745, it decreed that any preacher who was already a Freemason should receive a strict injunction, with which he should be compelled to comply, immediately to resign his membership, and abandon all practices connected with it ; and that in future the clergy should be forbidden, under strict penalties, to join the Craft." . . . "And this prohibition was to hold good even if it were alleged that the chief object of the society was to unite Christians in a bond of charity ; for in Holy Scripture they have so strong a bond that they can need no other."—*Vide The Secret Warfare of Freemasonry*, p. 66.

Frederick Prince of Orange, after being elected National Grand Master for life of the Grand Lodge of the Hague, Grand Orient in Brussels, and Grand Master of the Southern Belgic Lodges, resigned all these Masonic dignities and renounced the practice of Freemasonry, on the ground of its incompatibility with the profession of Christianity. He published the reasons for his resignation. Many others have tacitly followed his example.

Worshipful Master. "Then you will kneel with your left knee, keeping your right foot in the form of a square"—this the novice feels is a puzzler; however, it might have been worse—"place your right hand on this book, which is the volume of the Sacred Law"—(the Old Testament, in fact)—"while, with your left, you will support one point of these compasses to your naked breast, so as not to hurt yourself"—"They are not such sanguinary villains, after all," thinks the candidate to himself, and blesses his stars for his preservation so far)—"and then repeat after me the following obligation"—

This is a solemn moment, especially if the Worshipful Master should happen to be rather proud of his oratorical powers, and should flatter himself on his distinct enunciation of every word.

THE OATH.

"I, N. or M., in the presence of the Great Architect of the Universe, and of this warranted worthy and worshipful lodge of free and accepted Masons, regularly assembled and properly dedicated, do, hereby and hereon, most solemnly and sincerely swear"—here the candidate begins to think that there is such a thing as carrying a joke too far, especially if he has joined only for the sake of conviviality, and, as an Oxford Freemason once told me, "because he knew a lot of fellows"—"*that I will always hale*"—he wonders what this means, but there is no time to stop and ask—"conceal, and never reveal any part or parts, point or points, of the secrets and mysteries of or belonging to Masons which have been, shall now, or may hereafter be communicated to me," &c., &c., to the same effect. Then, "*I further promise that I will not write those secrets, print, carve, engrave, or otherwise them delineate*"—but here they are in the manual from which I am copying this, as nearly as possible word for word: a manual which a Past Master and several Master Masons have assured me is perfectly correct in every particular up to the Royal Arch degree—"or cause or suffer them to be done so by others if in my power to prevent it"—so I suppose he could not prevent the writing and publication of this manual, which is in constant use by Masons—"on anything moveable or immovable under the canopy of heaven"—now we know where Dr. Kenealy derives some of his fine figures of speech—"whereby or whereon," &c., &c., only an amplification of the above. Then, "*These several points I solemnly swear to observe without evasion, equivocation, or mental reservation of any kind*"—this stops the candidate in time just as he was meditating how he should tell a friend what they did to him—"under no less a penalty"—"Now it's coming," thinks the candidate, beginning to feel a little nervous—"on the violation of any of them than to HAVE MY THROAT CUT ACROSS"—the candidate's voice quivers a little over this, and he really would rather not play any more, but he dare not recede now—"MY TONGUE TORN OUT BY THE ROOT"—"Anything else?" thinks the candidate, wondering if any unworthy Mason ever suffered these penalties, and for the first time believing all he has heard of Italian secret societies, and what he has read about

Count Fosco in the *Woman in White*—"AND MY BODY BURIED IN THE SAND OF THE SEA AT LOW-WATER MARK, or a cable's length from shore, where the tide regularly ebbs and flows twice in twenty-four hours"—the latter portion of this has a reassuring sound, as it calls to mind Margate and Brighton, and, as it were, brings the candidate to life again—"or the more efficient punishment"—what! not done yet!—"of being branded as a wilfully perjured individual void of all moral worth, and unfit to be received into this warranted lodge or any other or society of Masons: SO HELP ME GOD"—perhaps a certain commandment occurs to the candidate's mind at this moment, but it is too late, and so this asseveration must go with the rest; for have not hundreds of others sworn all this before?—"So help me God, and keep me steadfast in this my great and solemn obligation of an entered Apprentice Freemason."

So much for the first oath; *c'est le premier pas qui coûte*. And if the candidate has swallowed *this*, he will swallow anything. But, I ask my readers (and I put it specially to the wife and sisters of Masons), *is this oath a jest, or is it not?* And if not, *is it compatible with the principles "of piety and virtue?"* Do statesmen think it immoral and dangerous, or do they think it harmless? and if harmless, why? It was under such an oath as this that the revolutionary plots were discussed in France, and by virtue of such an oath as this, Masons felt that they were bound to secrecy as to whatever passed in the lodge. I know that this was an abuse: but is it not liable to that very objection, namely, that the confidence of an individual, weak enough to take such an oath, can be so easily and so dangerously abused?⁷ Leaving this question to be answered by those who may feel inclined, we will dare to penetrate still further into the practices of the Masonic brotherhood, which are founded on the principles of "piety and virtue."

The Worshipful Master, after some instruction about the sun and moon, and his own office as Governor of the Lodge, proceeds thus to address the candidate—

"By your meek and candid behaviour this evening"—that is, when blindfolded, bound, and guarded—"you have escaped two great dangers." "Bravo!" thinks the candidate, "what a clever fellow am I." "But," continues the Worshipful Master, "there is a THIRD which will await you to the latest period of your existence." "Can't they let a poor fellow alone?" the candidate says to himself, thinking, perhaps, of Rob the Grinder in *Domby and Son*. "The dangers which you have escaped are those of STABBING AND STRANGLING"—"Am I among Thugs?" mentally inquires the victim, recalling how he has been told that Freemasonry is founded on "piety and virtue"—"for, at your entrance into the lodge, the sword was presented to your naked left breast"—"My!" mentally ejaculated the candidate—"so that, had you rashly attempted to rush forward, you would have been accessory to your own death by stabbing." Nice morality this, but worthy of what is to follow. "Not

⁷ This was substantially the ground taken for allowing the law with regard to Secret Oaths remain as it is (*vide* debate this session).

so," calmly continues the Worshipful Master, "*with the brother who held it; as he would only have remained firm to his duty.*" But would he have been given up to the police if he had done his duty in virtue of his office? and is this in strict accordance with his "civil, moral, and religious duty?"

It may be answered that all this is absurd. Be it so, but it is an absurdity to which God Himself has been invoked as a witness. The Worshipful Master continues, "*There was likewise this cable tow, with a running noose about your neck, which would have rendered any attempt at retreat equally fatal by strangling*"—that is, assassination was intended, or certainly playing at it, under such sanction as to make "killing" appear "no murder." "*But,*" goes on the Worshipful Master, "*the danger which will await you to your latest hour, is the penalty of your obligation, that you would rather have your throat cut across than to improperly divulge the secrets of Masonry.*"

Now is this a pleasant grace before meat? Is it the sort of thing to give you an appetite? Is it what the candidate expected? Is it pleasant? is it sociable? Is it not, on the contrary, opposed in every way to the real constitutional liberty of the subject, the moral freedom of the individual, and the religious freedom of the Christian? Is it an impious game for atheists, or is it a reality, seriously and solemnly undertaken by civilized men, professing, indeed, any religion except the tenets of Thuggism, and by freeborn, intelligent, sober, respectable Englishmen?

Here are bands of brothers sworn together to keep secrets from the world, and to cut the throats of any one of those dear brethren who should improperly divulge any of those secrets.

At Oxford and Cambridge, where the University Lodges (for such is the fraternal feeling that the University lodge will not have any fellowship with the Town lodge) would be comparatively empty but for recruits among the undergraduates, and so "dispensations" are granted by the Grand Lodge to enable young men *under age* to become Freemasons.

I have, personally, known men become Masons for convivial reasons: I have known men join on religious grounds, being attracted by the grand ideal of Universality falsely presented by Masonry. The latter, if they have retained their religious opinions, have generally quitted the body in disgust, after some unsuccessful attempt at reformation: or if they have remained members, they have slid unconsciously into Deism, while remaining, apparently, respectable members of the religious community to which they may happen to belong.

The second oath taken by a Fellow-craft contains this obligation under taken in the presence of "the Grand Geometrician of the Universe"—viz., "*All these points I most solemnly swear to obey, &c., &c., under no less a penalty on the violation of any of them, in addition to my former obligation, than to HAVE MY LEFT BREAST CUT OPEN, MY HEART TORN THEREFROM, and given to the ravenous birds of the air or the devouring*

beasts of the field as a prey: SO HELP ME ALMIGHTY GOD, and keep me steadfast in this my great and solemn obligation of a Fellow-craft Mason."

There can be no doubt as to the serious character of *this* abjuration at all events, and indeed they have been before removed by the Master praying over the candidate for the degree in these words: "*We supplicate the continuance of Thy aid, O merciful Lord, on behalf of ourselves and of him who kneels before Thee. May the work begun in Thy name be continued to Thy glory,*" &c., and then, shortly after, comes the oath with the penalty, the above prayer being joined in by the Brethren, whose pleasing duty it may be, in accordance with the "principles of piety and virtue," to cut an erring brother's throat, to throw his heart to the birds and beasts, and to bury what remains of him by the sad sea waves, without any undue interference on the part of the police.

What are Mazzini's schemes and the Orsini bombs but the natural consequences of men banding themselves together under such terrible oaths? And yet English Freemasons are the most convivial creatures in the world; only they "point, left, right," each with the sword of Damocles suspended over his head.

Regardless of their doom the little victims play.

The subjects of other rites and ceremonies, and the Masonic traditions, I may reserve for another paper, unless, before the month comes round, I be burked at a railway station, throttled in a crowd by one of the sociable Brethren sworn to vengeance on his way home from a grand lodge dinner at Freemasons' Tavern.

(Signed)

JOABERT M.

POSTSCRIPTUM.

Since the above article was in type, a book has appeared, entitled *The Secret Warfare of Freemasonry against Church and State*, which, though engaged only with continental Masonry, is well worth the attention of all interested in this subject. From the introduction, I make the following extract: "Is it even permissible to join a body which exacts on admission an oath of secrecy as regards its proceedings, aims, teaching? If these are innocent, the oath is useless, and therefore wrong; if they are not innocent, the oath is an immoral restraint of liberty, and therefore a graver offence against the first principles of right. Furthermore, there is presumptive evidence in favour of the second hypothesis; for it is a characteristic of evil that it ever shuns the light: *cæcum omne scelus*. Practices of mere philanthropy and Christian charity can only be impeded by the introduction of a secret oath, and can, therefore, never supply a plausible reason for its imposition. Under such circumstances, no one can advisedly join a secret society without violating the plain dictates of conscience; for to take an oath without a plain necessity is intrinsically evil."

In this introduction the greeting sent by the Grand Lodge of Italy to H.R.H. the Prince of Wales on his installation is noticed as being of

"grave significance." Its heading, as reported in the *Times* (April 29th, 1875), was, certainly, remarkable, considering the exalted rank and the constitutional position of the person to whom it was addressed. It began thus :

"Massoneria Universale Communione Italiana."
(*Universal Freemasonry.—Italian Communion.*)

"Libertà, Fratellanza, Uguaglianza."
(*Liberty, Fraternity, Equality.*)

Now, for the Heir Apparent to the throne of England, such a greeting from those whose sinister watchwords are "*Liberty, Fraternity, Equality*"—the "*in hoc signo vinces*" of Communism and Red Republicanism—is somewhat more than a convivial expression of postprandial sentiment. The Italian Grand Lodge, however, has not, as yet, been officially recognized by the English Masons, in spite of its protestations of "fraternal affection," and unbounded admiration for English Masonry.⁸ Lord Plunket's words are also quoted as to the immorality of such associations : "I consider an association bound by a secret oath to be extremely dangerous on the principles of common law ; inasmuch as they subtract from the State, and interpose between him and his allegiance to king."⁹

As to the object of the Masonic body in electing distinguished personages to official dignities, Monseigneur Dupanloup quotes the words of a distinguished Freemason, M. Louis Blanc :—"It seemed good to sovereigns, to Frederick the Great, to handle the trowel and to put on the apron. Why not ? Since the existence of the higher grades was carefully hidden from them, all they knew of Freemasonry was that which could be revealed to them without danger. They had no reason for concerning themselves about it, seeing that they were kept in the lower grades, in which they perceived nothing but an opportunity for amusement, joyful banquets, principles forsaken and resumed at the threshold of the lodges, formulas that had no reference to ordinary life—in a word, a comedy of equality. But in these matters comedy borders closely upon tragedy ; and the princes and nobles were induced to offer the cover of their name and the blind aid of their influence to secret undertakings directed against themselves."

The fact is that these distinguished personages holding positions of Masonic honour and dignity are mere puppets. They are "coached up" for special occasions by the aid of a manual and the practical

⁸ In the *Times* of July 19th, 1875, the following paragraph appeared : "The announcement was made on Saturday, at the consecration of a new Lodge named after the Princess of Wales at the Alexandra Palace, that H.R.H. the Grand Master of English Masons had given *official recognition* to the Grand Orient of Italy, and the announcement was received with warm applause by the large number of eminent Freemasons assembled on the occasion." Evidently the bandage which blindfolds the entered Apprentice has not yet been removed from the eyes of the English Grand Master and his amiable brothers in Masonry.

⁹ *Secret Warfare*, p. lvii.

assistance of an elder brother in the Craft who "knows the whole thing by heart." *A propos* of manuals, the only thoroughly trustworthy one is the well-known *Manual of Freemasonry*, by Richard Carlile, which may be taken as correct in all essential particulars.

The History of Secret Societies, in two volumes, recently published, is of very little value as regards any information it professes to give concerning Freemasonry. The writer evidently possesses a fertile imagination; but in a large number of what he seems to propound as "facts" he is utterly wrong, both in respect to Masonic and other bodies which he lugs in under the name of "Secret Societies;" and for the remainder he is generally more or less incorrect, except in the historic portion about Gnosticism. The author of the work pretends to treat Masonry as harmless, or rather, as *useless for the purpose it professes to have in view*. Richard Carlile, who professed to be more truly a Mason than Masons themselves, used similar language. To represent Masonry as harmless, or as beneath contempt, is the best service that can be rendered to the real aim and object of the Craft. A most interesting, and, at the same time, carefully written pamphlet on *The Secret Societies of the Middle Ages*, appeared, years ago, in the shape of an Oxford *Prize Essay*, by Americo Palfrey Marras, now, we believe, an examiner in that University. It is a pity that the authorities of Oxford and Cambridge do not turn their attention to the *principles* of Freemasonry, and its effect on the youth committed to their care.

J. M.

Catholic Review.

I.—SELECTIONS FROM FOREIGN CATHOLIC PERIODICALS.

St. Gregory the Seventh. By the Count de Montalembert.

III.

THE subordination of all Christians, even of crowned heads, to Pontifical authority, therefore involved in certain extreme cases the subordination of the Crown itself. None can question the right of the Church to direct consciences in temporal matters, to determine the nature of sin, to define the limits of good and of evil—in a word, to render an account of souls, and hence arose the inevitable conclusion, that it belonged to her to decide questions of conscience involved in the government of nations.

To call upon the Church, as was done successively by almost all Christian peoples, to arbitrate between subjects and their kings, and to adjudge to the crimes and abuses of sovereignty a retribution which is found underlying almost all the constitutions of the middle ages, was, no doubt, to extend her authority beyond the limits necessary to her existence, but it was not to overleap an abyss. It seemed simple enough that the Pastoral authority which had been given, according to the Apostolic words, to judge angels, to bind and to loose in heaven, should have also the right to judge, in final resort, earthly questions, and no one was surprized that that Church, which had received from God full power to procure the salvation of souls, should also be invested with that of guarding society and repressing excesses in those who troubled it.

It may be urged, that there is some difficulty in reconciling this doctrine, however suitable to the epoch of which we speak, with the vital principle of the distinction of the two powers, but logic is not always infallible, nor always beneficial, and if this was a theological or political inconsistency, we venture to say that there never existed a happier or more legitimate one.

A more just system has never been met with, or one more applicable to a society where the influence of religion was universal and undisputed, and certainly nothing could be conceived better calculated to maintain, and at the same time control, the royal authority.

In fact, the right of deposing criminal and incompetent kings, after having subjected them to public penance, was exercised by the bishops quite as much as by the Popes, and even before it was ever acted upon by the Popes. There is a memorable example in the case of Wamba, King of the Visigoths of Spain, who was obliged by the Spanish bishops to continue to wear a monastic habit, which he had assumed during a dangerous illness. After his deposition, the Fathers of the twelfth Council of Toledo, in 681, freed his subjects from their oath of fidelity.

It was also the bishops, with the Archbishop of Rheims at their head, who, in spite of the Pope, sanctioned and proclaimed the deposition of the Emperor, Louis le Débonnaire, at the Council of Compiègne, in 833. And though this sentence, unjust as it was, and soon after annulled, had excited general indignation throughout Christendom, yet it does not appear, in any contemporary record, that the right, by virtue of which the bishops acted, was disputed. With regard to a similar power exercised by the Popes, Fleury himself owns that two hundred years before the time of Gregory the Seventh the Sovereign Pontiffs began to regulate the rights of sovereigns.

It is difficult to see why the historian limits his statement to two centuries. Every one knows that as early as 752, Pope Zacharias was invited by the Franks to pronounce a sentence of expulsion against the Merovingian race. The imperial dignity, which was then the highest form of temporal power, was constituted a *sort of special fief of the Holy See*. It could only be conferred by the Pope on some prince who had taken a solemn oath to devote himself to the defence of the Church.

In accepting the imperial crown from the hands of Leo the Third, Charlemagne had ratified, in the eyes of the whole of Western Christendom, the universal supremacy of the Roman Pontiff. Louis le Débonnaire and Lothaire recognized, like the great Emperor, that the imperial dignity could only be conferred through the consecration of the Pope; and Louis the Second, writing to the Emperor of the East, Basil the Macedonian, expressly founds the rights of his ancestors to assume the imperial title on the fact of the imperial power having been conferred upon them by the Sovereign Pontiff.

Moreover, the father of Henry the Fourth, the Emperor Henry the Third—for a long time looked upon as the sovereign arbiter of the fate of the Papacy—had invoked Pontifical authority against the King of Castile, who laid claim to the imperial dignity, and he chose as umpire and judge in his controversy with this Prince, Hildebrand, then Legate of Pope Victor the Second at the Council of Tours (1055). Can it be then a matter of surprise that nations agreed to invest an authority which could confer the supreme dignity in the temporal order with the right to depose in certain cases those who held it? But the right of deposition was derived in a still more absolute manner from the power of excommunication, exercised from the very beginning, and which forbade those attainted by it from holding any relation whatsoever with the faithful, and consequently deprived them of all power over them, unless absolution was gained within the year that followed the promulgation of the sentence. This was a universal and uncontested law in the middle ages—a rule publicly recognized, established by all temporal powers as well as by the spiritual power, and adopted by the unanimous consent of nations, and especially of the German nation. Kings were not exempted from the operation of this rule. On the contrary, it was on them that the laws and usages more particularly entailed penalties, for obstinately resisting the judgments of the Church. How, indeed, could a society entirely Catholic place the exercise of supreme authority in the hands of a man who voluntarily excluded himself from the sacraments of the Church? How was it to be supposed that an excommunicated and impenitent Prince, who had betrayed God, would respect the faith sworn to his people? Even Henry the Fourth, at the very time when he made his Bishops pronounce a sentence of deposition against Gregory, acknowledged that he himself could be deposed if he abandoned the Faith. Those who defended this monarch confined themselves—according to Henry—to

he assertion that a sovereign could not be excommunicated, a pretence absurd in itself, and completely annihilated by Gregory in his famous letters to Hermann, Bishop of Metz, and contradicted, moreover, by numerous examples, beginning with the sentence pronounced by St. Ambrose against the great Theodosius, and confirmed by the more recent excommunication of Robert, King of the French, by Gregory the Fifth. But, apart from these facts, the right of excommunication—and, in certain cases, of deposition—was in principle established by the celebrated diplomas of Gregory the Great, who, in granting certain privileges to the Hospital of Autun and to the Monastery of St. Medard de Soissons, declared that all laics, even Kings, who dared to violate these privileges, should forfeit their dignities. Gregory took care to cite, and to invoke more than once, the formidable authority of his illustrious predecessor.

The legitimacy of this right, as it was exercised by Gregory the Seventh against Henry the Fourth, was unanimously recognized by the Princes and Prelates of the Empire, assembled at Friburg in October, 1076. They ratified it in the most solemn manner by declaring—conformably with the laws of the German Empire—the King suspended from his dignity, and further, by condemning him to be irrevocably deposed, if he did not obtain absolution before the expiration of a year from the time of his excommunication.

The most devoted partisans of Henry the Fourth, even the Bishops who took part in the sentence of deposition pronounced in his name against Gregory at the Convention of Worms, gave the monarch to understand that they could not keep their allegiance to him if he did not obtain absolution. Henry accepted the condition, and it was simply in obedience to this advice, and to the dictates of an astute policy, that he secretly crossed the Alps in the middle of winter, and came, to the great surprize of Gregory, to humble himself before his judge at Canossa, and to solicit absolution, in the absence of his accusers and before the expiration of the fatal year. Thanks to the extreme indulgence of Gregory this manœuvre succeeded. By means of some exterior testimonies of penitence and humiliation, and on his simple promise to present himself before the Diet of the German Lords, to be by them judged when the Pope thought fit, and to submit himself to the decree of the assembly presided over by the Head of the Church, Henry obtained the absolution he so much needed and so ardently desired. Thus this famous absolution of Canossa, far from being, as has been so often asserted, a humiliation imposed by the Pontiff, was a favour earnestly desired, adroitly sought for, and patiently solicited by the Emperor. Henry the Fourth, restrained by the presence of his mother, appeared at first to accept with gratitude and docility, at least in public, the conditions prescribed by Gregory. He knew perfectly well that he thus disarmed his most formidable enemies. This was a terrible blow to the German Princes, who had reckoned on the King's inability to justify himself, in their presence, as to the serious accusations which they were able to bring against him. Deceived in their expectations they elected Rodolph King, at the Diet of Forchheim (15th of March, 1077). But whilst the German Princes would have wished at any price to prevent Gregory from granting this absolution, the Italian Bishops bitterly reproached Henry for having solicited it, nor was it long before the Emperor gave way to their advice and was influenced by their promises. Exasperated by the news of the election of Rodolph, he protested against the Pontifical jurisdiction. But in this he yielded to the deplorable influence of the Bishops and of the Lords of Lombardy, who threatened to depose him and elect his son, because, they said, the Emperor had humbled

his pride before the Pope. The modern idea of the irresponsibility of royal power was, as we see, little known, and above all little acted on at this epoch, even by the most inveterate enemies of the Holy See.

It is true that at this time some prelates and clerics, servilely devoted to an immoral Prince, who favoured their incontinence, invented for the interest of their cause a doctrine which tended to free Kings from all responsibility and all repression, no matter how manifest were their crimes or how shameful their vices. But this doctrine, which a contemporary declares *unheard of* and incompatible with public right, was received by Catholics with a mixture of contempt and horror, and, from the tenth to the fourteenth century, not one single Doctor of note or esteem in the Church can be adduced as having admitted it; whilst, on the other hand, the law of the conditional and limited nature of royal power, and of the responsibility of sovereigns to the tribunal of the Vicar of Jesus Christ, has been professed and defended by the most eminent Doctors of the Church, and by the chiefs of the different nations up to the seventeenth century.

William the Conqueror has been much commended for refusing the oath of fidelity which Gregory demanded from him, and this Pope has been called by Bossuet a shameless claimant (*inverecundum petitozem*), to claim from the new King of England a homage that all the Emperors of the West were compelled to render to the Holy See. But no one can deny that William, having undertaken the conquest of England, thought proper to consult the Holy See on the right he pretended to have to the crown of that country, and that he obtained the recognition of that right from Pope Alexander the Second, on the recommendation of Hildebrand, then Cardinal Archdeacon. A Norman chronicle adds that the Prince then promised, if he succeeded, to hold the Kingdom of England solely of God, and of the Holy Father His Vicar.

Gregory was therefore well authorized to claim the execution of the promise thus made, and to exercise a special supremacy over the Prince, who had of his own accord invoked Pontifical authority to sanction his right. William did not contest the legitimacy of this supremacy in general—he only denied having made any promises. Gregory did not insist upon it, but he refused in his turn the arrears of contribution which, later on, William, in compensation for his refusal, offered him. With a just and Christian high-mindedness he wrote to his Legate—"I will not have the money without the honour."

There were other States over which the Papacy was entitled to exercise the right of repression, not only in virtue of its spiritual supremacy, but also of a sovereignty special and direct, in virtue of old traditions, of special donations, or of the express desire of the inhabitants. These were weak and isolated countries, or kingdoms but recently delivered from the Pagan yoke, or else newly admitted on other grounds into the great Christian family. We can instance, in the first place, the new State formed by the chivalrous Normans in the two Sicilies. Its glorious founder, Robert Guiscard, proclaimed the origin and the conditions of its existence in his reply to the ambassadors of Henry the Fourth, who had proposed to him to be a vassal of the Empire, and offered him the royal dignity at that condition. "I have delivered this land from the power of the Greeks, with great effusion of blood, in great poverty and great misery. To repress the pride of the Saracens I have endured, beyond the seas, hunger and many tribulations. And in order to obtain the help of God, and that my superior St. Peter and my lord St. Paul, to whom all the kingdoms of the world are subject, may pray to Him for me, I have chosen to submit myself to their Vicar the Pope,

with all the land which I have conquered ; and I have made it a point to receive it from the hands of the Pontiff, so that, by the power of God, I may be protected against the malice of the Saracens, and conquer the pride of foreign oppressors and tyrants in Apulia and in Calabria, where the errors of the Saracens prevail. Now as the Lord Almighty has made me greater than any one of my people, *it becomes me* to submit to God, who has specially protected me, and Whose grace has made me victorious, and it is from Him that I acknowledge to hold the territory you say you wish to bestow on me."

We may also cite Corsica, Sardinia, Dalmatia, Spain, Provence, Hungary, Servia, Russia, and Poland, amongst the countries over which Gregory the Seventh claimed and exercised a temporal and direct supremacy, but it may be confidently asserted that the Papal supremacy was, in these special cases, a benefit and an advantage to the countries in question. Far from impairing their dignity or their independence, it was for the protection of that dignity and that independence that Gregory the Seventh extended over these States the shield of his authority. Still more frequently it was to secure their freedom against the assaults of more powerful neighbours, and especially against the encroachments of the German Emperors, who arrogated to themselves a general supremacy over all other sovereigns.

He did indeed dethrone Boleslas the Cruel, to punish him for having cut in pieces St. Stanislaus, Bishop of Cracow, and took away from Poland the title of Kingdom. But this sentence, which no one disputed, and which delivered the Poles from a wicked tyrant, was in accordance with defined and acknowledged stipulations relative to the royal power, in countries the sovereigns of which had but recently petitioned and obtained from the Holy See the title of Kings. In return Gregory the Seventh protected the newly created sovereignty of Russia, then still Catholic, from the encroachment of the Poles, and granted to the son of Demetrius, King of Russia, at his own express desire, the privilege of holding his kingdom of the Holy See, as a gift from St. Peter. Having conferred on another, Demetrius, Duke of Croatia and of Dalmatia, the title of King, the Pope watched over this new nationality with jealous care. He wrote in the following terms to a chieftain who, after having sworn fidelity to St. Peter, had nevertheless taken arms against the new King. "We warn your nobleness, and, on the part of the Blessed Peter, we command you, not to attempt again to make war on this Prince, for be certain that every thing you venture to do against him, you venture to do against the Apostolic See. If you have any complaint against Demetrius, you should appeal to us, instead of arming yourself against him in defiance of the Holy See. If you do not repent of your rashness, or venture to resist our commands, know and be assured that we will draw the sword of the Blessed Peter to repel your audacity, and that we will chastise you unless you and your adherents do penance."

Again, if Gregory intervened in the dispute regarding the succession to the throne of Hungary, it was to prevent this kingdom—the founder of which, St. Stephen, had received from Rome the crown and the title *Apostolic*—from becoming, through the fault of one of the candidates, a fief of the kingdom of Germany. "You know," wrote the Pope to the Hungarian sovereign, "that the kingdom of Hungary, like many others, must be free, and not subjected to any other sovereignty than that of the Holy Universal and Roman Church, its mother, whose subjects are treated, *not as serfs, but as sons*." And elsewhere he says: "This very noble kingdom ought to flourish in peace, by her own sovereign power, and her King must not become a petty sovereign. By despising the noble patronage of St. Peter,

to which you know that this kingdom owes fealty, King Solomon has been obliged to submit himself to the German Emperor, and since then has been only a petty King."

Thus the proud and jealous independence of the people of Hungary, so industriously preserved through many ages, had for its first defender against Germany the Pope, Gregory the Seventh.

We may conclude, from the preceding facts, that in the political direction of Christian society, no less than in the government of the Church, Gregory the Seventh never innovated—never added to the doctrine of his predecessors, but was only the first rigorously to carry into effect a doctrine deeply rooted in the convictions of all Christian people. Moreover, good faith obliges us to admit that, in carrying out these principles, the illustrious Pontiff firmly believed—as he said in his letters to the faithful in Germany—that he was fulfilling an imperious duty, imposed upon him by laws human and divine.

It may be also remarked that the right which Gregory the Seventh is so severely blamed for exercising, was never contested in the middle ages, except by those who came under its ban; and we may fairly ask whether culprits have ever been accepted as judges of the lawfulness of a penalty directed against themselves? In the middle ages *the right was not contested*, though the *infliction of the penalty* was resisted. In modern times, on the contrary, it is allowed that the punishment may have been deserved, though the right of inflicting it has been considered inordinate. The fact on the one hand, and the right on the other hand, have been approved and admitted by judges—different, indeed, but whose united and favourable suffrages on a point where they can be least suspected of partiality, form a verdict which allows of no appeal.

There is another view of the case, which deserves, in the highest degree, the attention and sympathy of the friends of truth. Apart from the question of divine right and of Catholic tradition, it is important to recognize that Gregory the Seventh, by his principles and conduct, rendered most signal service to the political constitution of Christian Europe, and contributed to the maintenance of those liberties which protected society at that period against despotism.

Christendom, in the middle ages, held with good reason in abhorrence the monstrous absorption of all the social strength of humanity in one single power, unlimited and uncontrolled. Its belief, its traditions, and its customs all combined to inspire it with an invincible repugnance to absolute and unconditional monarchy, such as Pagan Rome had endured under the Emperors—such as, in the eleventh century, still existed in all its shameful characteristics amongst the Greeks of Constantinople. Thanks to the support of the Papacy, Christianity was long preserved from this yoke by the noble and fruitful struggle inaugurated by Gregory, and known by the name of the *war of investitures*, or the *war of the priesthood against the Empire*. He had the honour of delaying for centuries the establishment, in Europe, of absolute power and the triumph of pagan traditions, which since then have transformed the nations of Europe into men governed by police or employés in the service of the law, the interpreters of this law into instruments of tyranny, the Court of Kings into anti-chambers, royalty an idol, and the Church into a servant.

Superficial writers have imagined that they saw in Gregory's efforts a reaction against the feudal system; this evinces great ignorance of the nature of that system, and of the spirit of the Pontiff. Then, as always, monarchical power had a tendency to increase indefinitely. The principle of the social

constitution of the middle ages was to keep the royal authority in check by that of the Lords and Prelates. These last often formed a majority in the political assemblies of the Empire, and of the other Christian kingdoms. The hereditary transmission of great fiefs secured the independence of lay feudatories; but the prelates would have been no longer anything but the instruments of monarchical ambition, if by simony and investiture kings had acquired the power of becoming absolute masters of ecclesiastical dignities, and of choosing at their discretion, from amongst the unworthy and obscure clerics who frequented their courts, servile creatures of their will, and making them bishops and abbots, occupying the first rank in the government of States and in the sovereign assemblies. Social equilibrium would thus have been destroyed. It could only be maintained by purity in ecclesiastical elections, which had itself no other safeguard than the energetic resistance and entire independence of the Roman Pontificate. It was therefore on the Papacy that the social constitution of the middle ages definitively rested, and this explains why, in their struggles with the Emperors, the Popes could almost always reckon on the support of those of the great lay vassals of the Crown who were not connected with the reigning house by consanguinity or obligations of recent date.

This support was not wanting to Gregory the Seventh, and he on his side did not deceive the expectations of these noble-hearted men, who relied upon him, with the certainty of finding, in the highest authority of the Christian world, an efficacious aid in resisting the invasions of the Imperial power, this was the secret of the alliance that attaches to his cause, not only the greater number of the princes and lords of the Empire, and all the princes of Saxony and Lower Germany, but also those of the South, such as Rodolph, Duke of Swabia, Welf, Duke of Bavaria, the powerful house of Zahringen, the Counts of Stoffeln, of Stühlingen, of Toggenburg, and many others.

All these laymen fought with energy and perseverance—under the banner of the Church—against Henry the Fourth, whilst the great majority of the bishops of Germany, who had obtained their sees by simony, sided with the Emperor, and supported him with all their power. The German nobility, apart from the indignation which they could not but feel at witnessing the triumph of simony, and the fearful scandal of the private life of their King, had also to accuse him of the most serious infringements of the rights and liberties by which the constitution of the Empire guaranteed the dignity and independence of each of the members of the great Germanic body.

Surrounded by simoniacal prelates, and men of low condition whom he had elevated to the highest honours, Henry meditated the destruction of the nobility, who, with the clergy, formed at that time the real and legal strength of the nation. The titularies of the most important fiefs of the Empire were deprived of their rights without trial, taxes capriciously levied, arbitrary imprisonments, plunder, oppression, and all kinds of violence, were the means employed by the Prince. His avowed object was to constitute an absolute monarchy, or, in the words of an ancient chronicle, “not to allow any other lord to exist in his kingdom but himself, so that he, alone, might be the master of all.”

With this view, as the assembled princes declared at Tribur in 1076, he caused fortresses to be erected, not to protect the Empire against the Pagans, but to rob his own country of all security, and to bow down the necks of free men under the yoke of the harshest servitude; “the blood of innumerable innocent persons has been shed by his orders,” said St. Gebhard, Archbishop of Salzburg, “with no other object than to make serfs of the sons of free men.”

II.—REVIEWS AND NOTICES.

1. *Critico-Biblical Disquisition on the time during which Christ lay in the Tomb.* By Francis de Hieronymo Jovino, S.J., Professor of Sacred Scripture and Oriental Languages in Woodstock College, Maryland. (Latin and English). Woodstock College Print, 1875.

This handsomely printed essay, in Latin on one page, English on the other, suggests many reflections which are independent of the particular question which has given rise to its publication. America has not as yet taken its place as the home of Catholic learning and high theological education. In saying this, we are by no means uttering a reproach, nor do we mean in any way to undervalue the learning which has been and is possessed by the American Catholics as a body. It is evident, on the face of the matter, that under the circumstances which have marked the immense and rapid growth of Catholicism in the United States, it would have been little short of miraculous if great seats of theological science had been improvised at a time when the utmost efforts of the clergy, both secular and regular, were strained to keep pace with the inflowing tide of emigrants, and to furnish them with churches and schools and pastors in proportion to their needs. Not everything can be done at once, even in America, and there is a dash and ready vigour about American Catholics which has sometimes appeared to be impatient of the slow processes which the deep and methodical study of the sacred sciences require. There have been very eminent men among their prelates and clergy, and they have furnished the Church with more than one writer of conspicuous power. We may take the present publication as an earnest that America will soon be by no means behind the Old World in the more general diffusion of theological and critical science of the highest kind.

The display of power and erudition which characterizes this publication makes us wish that the author had a more worthy opponent on whom to exercise his undoubted abilities as a controversialist. The Mr. Watson, whose strange conceit about the time during which our Blessed Lord lay in His grave is here scattered to the winds, may perhaps have some kind of repetition among the readers of the "Religious Herald, Richmond, Va.," but his name has not yet made its way across the broad Atlantic as a writer of any consideration. When we say that his idea is that our Lord suffered on Wednesday in Holy Week, was buried before sunset on that day, and rose again about the same time on Holy Saturday, we have perhaps stated enough to make any well-informed and right-feeling Catholic desire to see him consigned to a cell in the literary Bedlam contiguous to that of Mr. Gladstone himself. We cannot say that Mr. Watson's translation, which is carefully printed and turned into Latin by Father Jovino, strikes us as containing any argument worthy of notice. Every one is ready to acknowledge that some words of our Lord's about Jonas

being in the belly of the whale "three days and three nights," and comparing this to His own remaining in the grave, present at first sight, and only at first sight, a certain difficulty to the interpreter of Scripture, which is, to use a distinction of Dr. Newman's, a difficulty, but not one that creates a doubt, as to the truth of the received opinion on the subject. When this is once removed, as it is satisfactorily removed by Father Jovino, there remains very little in Mr. Watson's statement of opinion worthy of attention. But we are glad that it has elicited so much sound learning and cogent argument as Father Jovino has given us, and we shall look forward with much pleasure to any future works or Scriptural exegesis which he may find occasion to publish.

-
2. *The Spiritual Conflict and Conquest.* By Dom. J. Castaniza, O.S.B. Edited with Preface and Notes, by Canon Vaughan, Monk of the English Benedictine Congregation. Reprinted from the Old English Translation of 1652. Second Edition. Burns and Oates, 1875.

We are very glad indeed to welcome the Second Edition of this standard work. It is not often that a Second Edition calls for much remark, except by way of congratulation. But we may notice the Preface to this Edition as particularly worthy of attention. It appears that "a learned antiquarian friend" has drawn the attention of the Editor to the very great doubts which exist as to the correctness of the Benedictine tradition, which claims the famous *Spiritual Combat* for Castaniza as its author. Canon Vaughan, without going into the question at any length, admits candidly that there are weighty arguments for the almost universal belief of Catholics as to the authorship, attributing it to the famous Theatine, Lorenzo Scupoli. He has simply done his duty, in reprinting an old version, in keeping the author's name on the title-page as he found it. It can matter very little, of course, either to Castaniza or to Scupoli, what is now thought of the authorship: but we believe there are very good reasons for not abandoning the common opinion, which was evidently that of St. Francis of Sales, who did so much to make the book popular. There are some internal marks which make it clear to those familiar with the *Spiritual Exercises* of St. Ignatius that the author, whoever he was, must have made their acquaintance. This, however, is quite as possible in the case of Castaniza as of Scupoli himself.

-
3. *Le Mouvement Communal et Municipal au Moyen Age.* Par Edmond Demolins. Paris: Didier et Cie, 1875.

M. Demolins in his Preface gives an account of this very important and interesting little book. A student of the University of France, he possessed such a knowledge of history as could be gained from the cram-books in vogue in that institution. He could talk glibly about modern light and the darkness of the middle ages. He might know

something of the history of the Revolution, but of the history of his country he knew absolutely nothing. By the perusal of the works of Augustine Thierry a fresh light began to dawn upon his mind; and he was gradually led to recognize the middle ages as the period when popular liberties—a phrase bearing a much more real meaning than the term modern liberty by which it has been supplanted—flourished with a vigour and universality unknown in recent times. And as his reading extended, he found that Thierry's conclusions were borne out with more or less fulness by writers such as Guizot, Monteil, Lavallée, Henri Martin, Mignet, Michelet, and Renan. The book which is the subject of our present notice is the result of five years' study of the weighty questions thus opened out to the author.

The subjects treated of, and the method of treatment, are sufficiently indicated by the headings of the three parts into which the work is divided—Liberties hoped for, liberties won, and liberties lost. For centuries the great process of evolution and decadence unrolled itself; it received its final "exploitation" in the Great Revolution.

Of the first great act of development the Church was the source and the nursing mother. Varied were the elements that she had to fashion into shape. The Roman municipality, with an organization admirably adapted to fiscal requirements, had no pretensions to liberty. The slave, the rich, and Cæsar; these three elements were the constituents of the society of the Roman world. The barbarians burst in with the traditions of their primeval forests; and out of the seething chaldron of the composite population the Bishops, as the protectors of the cities, educed the foundations of the freedom and liberties of the succeeding ages. Under their auspices appeared the first beginnings of the electoral rights that were subsequently so amply developed. Then followed a period of transition, which witnessed the formation of the feudal system; a system that has been correctly designated one of *deliverance* rather than of oppression, of which the fundamental notion was a well-balanced reciprocity of services and of protection, of duties and of rights.

But it was not until the beginning of the eleventh century that it was given to one man to inaugurate the struggle that issued in the establishment of a system of public liberties such as the world had never seen, and such as it certainly does not see at the present day. That man was the son of the poor carpenter of Soane, Hildebrand, the great Pontiff Gregory the Seventh. By proclaiming the grand idea of the Christian Republic and the monarchy of the Church, he framed the way for the overthrow of feudalism and the setting up of the great communal system in its place. Italy thus became, under the guidance of the Pope and his bishops, the cradle of municipal liberties, and the great centre of resistance to the tyrannies of the day. The organization of the Truce of God owed its existence to the clergy, and was used as a means of protection against the power of the feudal lords. This organization gradually assumed the ultimate form of the commune, or *peace*, as

it was often called, the very employment of this latter term sufficiently indicating the origin of the commune and the method of its evolution. It was a vigorous life that of those old communes with which in the shape of town or village the whole of France in the middle ages was overspread. At the sound of the bell the burghers assembled to pledge themselves to one another by oath to maintain their liberties, to elect their magistrates, to discuss in the public square the affairs of the commune, and to make the requisite assessments for their own expenditure and for the public service. They had their militia and their tribunals, and corresponded directly with the sovereign himself. If bound to military service, its period did not sometimes extend beyond a day or two, and the obligation in some cases ceased at a certain distance from their homes. A different state of society this to the crushing bureaucracy and vast standing armies of our own times. While the central authority was respected, there was full freedom of local administration, and the people lived in the actual enjoyment of the amplest liberties, and not under the vain delusions of paper constitutions.

The third part of M. Demolins' book shows how these liberties were lost. Towards the fourteenth century the lawyers, under the inspirations of the Roman law, the study of which had revived, gradually restored the pagan notion of the omnipotence of Cæsar, and thus sowed the seeds of future revolutions and ruined the public liberties of France. Even Michelet can call the lawyers *the destroyers of the middle ages*, and the *tyrants* of France. Under their auspices the spirit of Gallicanism was evoked in the relations between Church and State, and that crushing centralization introduced which was at once the cause of the Revolution and its most potent instrument when once accomplished. But all this was not accomplished without long and energetic resistance on the part of the *Tiers Etat*; a resistance which was sometimes successful in the states-general, and formed the most vigorous element in the great struggle of the League, a body which M. Demolins puts in its true light, as the last great effort of the French people to recover the liberties that were slipping from their grasp, and to vindicate the old rights and traditions of their native land.

Last of all succeeds the Revolution, of which M. Demolins justly says: "There our task is concluded; for where the history of the Revolution commences the history of liberty ends."

The practical outcome of the author's labours is an eloquent appeal for the recovery of the liberties of the olden time. We cannot conclude this notice of a remarkable book better than by giving the striking words, quoted by M. Demolins, of Thierry on a subject so fraught with interest to France at the present moment, and not only to France but to the world at large: "Let us recover then our local representations, not by invoking in a vague manner the lights of the century, but in recalling to mind and putting in evidence that which was from time immemorial rooted in the soil of France, the franchises of her provinces and towns."

4. *L'Organisation de la Famille.* Par M. F. Le Play. Deuxième Edition. Paris : Dentu et Albert Sauher. Tours : Manie, 1875.

The world has had before its eyes for the last five years the spectacle of one of the greatest nations in the world in a condition of political disorganization so complete as sometimes to verge on dissolution ; and this state of disorganization is simply attributable to the successive revolutions to which the country has been subjected. Since 1789, France has eleven times changed by violence its form of government and the persons to whom that government was entrusted.

Nor have the effects of these rapidly succeeding shocks been confined to the political order alone ; they have penetrated down to the lowest strata of the whole social system. Disorganization has spread everywhere, like a festering wound, and pervaded the primary constituent element of all social and political life, the family itself, which the principles of the revolution have laid waste by their pestilential ravages. An attempt is made in the remarkable book that forms the subject of our present notice to check these ravages and to supply an adequate remedy. The author, in his short preface, indicates the nature of that remedy. "To withdraw the family from the regime of destruction created by the Reign of Terror and the First Empire ; to recognize in the father that authority which he exercises in every nation that is free and prosperous ; to put him in a condition to restore, step by step, peace with respect and obedience in private life, in local government, and in the State." The method by which he hopes to commend his views to the notice of his fellow-countrymen is, "to point out to contemporaries, amongst the different organizations of the family, the best model that is furnished by national traditions and by a comparative observation of the different European populations."

These family organizations can be reduced to three normal types. The first is the patriarchal form, still flourishing in the vast plains of Central Asia. The second is the unstable type, which finds its first manifestation in the primitive hunters and nomads who peopled the West. In the patriarchal family, which carries us back to the Scriptural pictures of the life of Abraham and his descendants, the father was absolute chief over the whole of the members of which it was composed. When the family became too numerous for the locality in which it was placed, some of its members would leave the parent stock to found in some other territory a similar community, carrying with them "the ideas, the habits of respect, the sentiments and the memory of their ancestors," in which they had themselves been brought up.

The unstable type finds its exemplification in the modern family, especially in the modern French family, where the father is rarely obeyed, yet more rarely respected, despised and ill-treated in his old age, and unsoothed at his last hour by the affection of his children. This form of family, in which the "home is constituted by the union of a young couple, goes on increasing by the birth of children," who

in their turn grow up and leave the domestic hearth, and set up an independent and isolated family of their own. In this form we have the embodiment of individualism, as in the patriarchal type we have the principle of community carried to its farthest limits.

But there is a third form, intermediate between the two that have been noticed, to which M. Le Play gives the name of the *Famille-souche*, or "stock-family," and which combines the stability of the patriarchal with some measure of the individual freedom of the second type. The family homestead and the instruments of industry are handed down from the father to such one of his children as he may have associated with himself in the government of the family during his lifetime, and upon the heir thus constituted devolves the duty of maintaining the family and handing down to his successor similarly chosen the deposit of the family traditions of obedience, of respect, and of industry that he has himself received from his ancestors. The other members of the family either elect to remain in their paternal home in the state of celibacy, or they marry in order to found similar homes of their own. The father enjoys that authority which is his by the law of God; he is the master of the fortunes of the family, which he administers for the general good according to the traditions in which he has been nurtured.

It is to the restoration of some such system as this that M. Le Play looks for the healing and restoration of France. We say restoration, for the author shows that this form of family existed in France before the conquest of Gaul by the Romans, and that it is even yet by no means extinct. Notwithstanding the encroachments of the civil code on personal liberties, and the extinction of testamentary rights resulting in the minutest subdivision of property on the death of each proprietor, and all the evils consequent upon it, evils, the existence of which are increasingly demonstrated by the voluntary sterility of marriages, the impoverishment of peasant proprietors, and the ill-treatment of parents in their declining years, families are still found in the south of France who, by various devices, and under exceptionally favourable circumstances, contrive to maintain their old traditional forms. The author's second book is devoted to a description of one such family near Cauterets, in the ancient district of the Lavedan, which bears the name of Melouga, and which, for good four hundred years, has been seated upon and cultivated the same piece of land on the system above described. M. Le Play enters into the minutest details of the family and industrial life of this interesting little group, consisting at present of fifteen persons, and the study of these details will, better than anything else, enable our readers to understand the system itself.

The conclusions that M. Le Play deduces from his investigations may be thus summed up, in the words of an able writer, M. Cauvin, in the *Revue Catholique des Institutions et du Droit* for July, 1875:—
(1) The civil code, by introducing the forced division of patrimonies, has been the cause, on the one hand, of the indefinite parcelling out

and dispersion of property, and on the other, the destruction of all paternal authority. (2) The intervention of the civil law in family compacts, whenever there is question of the settlement of property, in lieu of simply securing liberty, is destructive of the natural law, of the regular exercise of which it ought to be the only guardian. (3) The disorganization of the family caused by the permanent action of a revolutionary legislation renders the exercise of power by governments a matter of extreme difficulty, for it deprives them of that moral and material support without which they cannot discharge their functions."

These conclusions are supported by three somewhat lengthy appendices, bearing names well known in connection with topics of this kind, those of MM. E. Cheysson, Le Play, and C. Jannet; and they cannot be without interest to English readers. At a time like the present, when all is fluid and changeful amongst us in every conceivable line of thought, and when so many wild speculations are rife on every possible subject, it will not be without its use to see what has been the fruit of such speculations on the moral and material condition of a country which once was the apex of the world.

5. *Bulletino di Archeologia Cristiana* del Commendatore Giovanni Battista de Rossi. Seconda Serie, no. ii. anno sesto.

Nearly the whole of the present number is occupied with the Basilica of Domitilla, the latest discoveries in the catacombs over which it is erected, researches into the inscriptions found there, and a deeply interesting inquiry into the history of Flavia Domitilla.

The Basilica stands on the second story of the catacombs, the third or uppermost being in great part destroyed to make way for the building. This naturally was the earliest portion of the cemetery, and it is proved from the remains of the tombs therein, that it belongs to the latter half of the fourth century. The Basilica was therefore begun at the close of the fourth century, and Cav. Rossi demonstrates the precise date of its erection to have been between 390 and 395.

One of the inscriptions gives rise to a valuable dissertation on the titular church *de Fasciola*, which the author shows to have been SS. Nereus and Achilleus, so well known as the church of Cardinal Baronius, who restored it. Another inscription, the monogram of *Flavilla*, leads to an investigation into the Christians of the Flavian family. It is proved clearly that besides Domitilla, the wife of the Consul Flavius Clemens, who was exiled to Pandataria, when her husband had fallen a victim to the jealousy of Domitian, another Domitilla, her neice, was sent to the Island of Ponza—both noble ladies falling under the common sentence of "Atheism and Judaism," or in other ways, "of being Christians." Domitian's last act of cruelty seems to have been motivated by his jealousy of Clemens, whose sons he had named his heirs to the throne, and to it was attributed the conspiracy which in turn cost him his life.

A curious discrepancy between the old records of ancient inscriptions and their readings on their re-discovery is accounted for by the fact that any blunder of the sculptor was concealed by stucco, which in lapse of years has fallen out and revealed the original error.

-
6. *A New Model for Youth.* The Life of Richard Aloysius Pennefather. By one of his masters. Dublin : M^cGlashan and Gill. London : Burns and Oates, 1875.

This little volume is the biography of one who seems to have been a very holy youth, who died at the age of eighteen while a scholastic in the Marist establishment of the Order of the Immaculate Heart of Mary and the Holy Ghost, founded by P. Liebermann. This congregation has a number of missions on the coast of Africa, and it was his desire to devote his life to the blacks of that coast which led the young Richard Aloysius Pennefather to enter religion. His father, a gentleman of Tipperary, at first opposed his vocation, but in an illness which soon followed, in which he died, he retracted his refusal. We have already said that death cut short the holy religious life of the son at the early age already mentioned. The life is that of a bright sprightly boy, at first overpetted at home, but on whom his first communion at school made a very deep impression, and who ever afterwards pressed on with unremitting perseverance in the path of perfection. The little book is very well and judiciously written.

-
7. *The Persecutions of Annam.* A history of Christianity in Cochin China and Tonking. By John R. Shortland, M.A., Canon of Plymouth, author of the *Corean Martyrs*. London : Burns and Oates, 1875.

Canon Shortland gives in his preface three very good reasons why the efforts of missionary work in modern days should be brought before English Catholics. The illustrated *Missions Catholiques*, which appear in so many languages, are hardly known amongst us. The *Annals of the Propagation of the Faith*, though full of interest, are, we fear, put in the shade by the host of publications which force themselves more obtrusively on ordinary people in the world. The many home wants of the Church will serve as an excuse for what has often too much of an *amor di campanile*, and exclusive devotion to local interests about it to be the purest gold of charity, spite of the well known proverb. If we except some of the religious bodies, the Seminary at Mill Hill is the only contribution to missionary labour in England, for we believe that this country receives more than it gives to the Society for the Propagation of the Faith.

Beautifully printed and illustrated by two maps, Canon Shortland's work is a valuable contribution to our literature on foreign missions. The account of the successes and of the reverses of the Faith in the joint kingdoms of Tonking and Cochin China are told simply and

clearly. The charm that the traveller's story always possesses is surely doubled when it serves only as an accompaniment to the recital of such soul-stirring and heroic deeds for God and His Faith.

-
8. *Paris, ses Organes, ses Fonctions, et sa Vie dans la seconde moitié du XIX^{me} siècle.*
Par Maxime du Camp. Paris : Hachette (six vols). 1875.

M. De Camp has now finished what is in many respects a great and very interesting work on the great Babylon of modern Europe—perhaps we should rather say, one of the great Babylons. We shall give our readers a sufficient idea of his method, if we mention the contents of his several volumes. The first volume is devoted to the Post Office, Telegraphs, Public Carriages, Railways, and the River. The second treats of the ways and means of sustenance for the city—bread, meat, wine, the markets, tobacco, cash, and the Bank. The third volume enters on darker subjects—the Malefactors, the Police, the Courts, the Prisons, the Guillotine, and the organization of vice. The next volume—a very interesting one—passes to the subjects of Mendicity, Public Relief, Hospitals, Buildings, Asylums for Old Age, and the Insane. The fifth deals with the Monts de Piété, Instruction, the Deaf and Dumb, the Blind Children, the Water and Light Supply, and the Sewerage. The last volume begins with a chapter called “La Fortune de Paris,” and goes on to the Civil Institutions, Cemeteries, theatres, libraries, and journals—ending with a chapter on “Le Parisien.” It is worth while to mention that the book is written in a somewhat anti-Catholic spirit, but where this has not influenced the writer, we imagine that his details are tolerably trustworthy.

9. Messrs. Richardson of Derby have published a translation of the Abbé Perreyre's *Meditations on the Way of the Cross*. The high place the writer held in the esteem and affection of Father Lacordaire sufficiently recommend his works.—A form of hearing Mass, said to have been found in the handwriting of St. Francis of Sales, with other documents on the Passion, make it a useful handbook of devotion.—The same firm has recently published the translation of the *Chevalier de Montzey's Life of Father Eudes*, the cause of whose beatification is said to be making successful progress. The Chevalier is of the family of the venerable Father, and he has done his work with conscientious care. He cites an interesting passage from a letter of Fleury to the historian of the *Eudistes*, which bears upon a question which has been much debated of late years. “I have always disapproved of the method of modern writers, who after writing the life of a saint or other illustrious person, give a treatise on their virtues as a separate thing. They ought to be exhibited by *facts and actions*. It is not worth while to write a life of mere thoughts and reflexions. Facts must be given as circumstantially as possible.” M. de Montzey has followed this advice,

and gives a very interesting sketch of the times in which Father Eudes lived and worked, the necessary background to any historical sketch. An appendix contains the after history of the Congregations which he founded, of which that of the Good Shepherd is the best known in England.

-
10. *The Orphan's Friend.* A Series of Plain Instructions for the use of Orphans after leaving the Asylum, &c. By A. A. Lambing, late Chaplain of St. Paul's Catholic Orphan Asylum, Pittsburgh. London: Burns and Oates. New York: Sadlier.
 11. *The Orphan Sisters; or, The Problem Solved.* By Mary J. Hoffman. *Ibid.*
 12. *Adventures of Sidney Flint.* By the Author of *Alice Harman.* *Ibid.*
 13. *The Little Crown of St. Joseph.* By a Sister of St. Joseph. *Ibid.*
 14. *The Family.* By the Rev. A. Riche. Translated by Mrs. J. Sadlier. *Ibid.*

Our American friends are fast eclipsing us poor English-speaking Catholics of the Eastern Hemisphere. Some years ago it used to be said that there were plenty of Catholic writers in England and Ireland, and plenty of Catholic readers in America. The difficulty was to bring the two together. We believe we still may faintly congratulate ourselves on the fact that American Catholic newspapers—not to speak of magazines—sometimes do us the honour, in that free and noble style which characterizes all that is Transatlantic, to avail themselves of our poor lucubrations for their own columns. Now, however, we are glad to see that Catholic America has an increasing crop of writers of her own. The handful of books before us is an excellent specimen of their labours. The first is a set of very good plain and practical instructions, by the Chaplain of an Orphanage, who has every right to know what is wanted by the class of desolate souls to whom he addresses himself with so much charity. The two next are very fair Catholic stories indeed. The devotional work, *The Little Crown of St. Joseph*, deserves especial honour for its solid and varied piety. The last work on the list is a translation, very well done, from a work which is small in bulk, but which hits off very pointedly the chief elements of the subject of which it treats.

III.—OLD ENGLISH DEVOTION TO OUR BLESSED LADY.

A Catalogue of Shrines, Offerings, Bequests, &c.

PART IX.—(LONDON—NEWENHAM, CAMBRIDGESHIRE).

The Temple Church.

This beautiful church was consecrated by Heraclius, the Patriarch of Jerusalem, during his visit to England in 1185, and who died at the siege of Acre, in 1190. The following inscription was placed over the door leading into the cloister :

✠ ANNO · AB · INCARNATIONE · DOMINI · MCLXXXV
DEDICATA · EST · HEC · ECCLESIA · IN · HONORE
BEATE · MARIE · A · DOMINO · ERACLIO · DEI · GRATIA
SANCTE · RESURRECTIONIS · ECCLESIE · PATRIARCHA
IIII · IDVS · FEBRVARII · QUI · EAM · ANNATIM · PETEN-
TIBUS · DE · INIVNTA · SIBI · PENITENTIA · LX · DIES
INDVLST.¹⁸

The English Knights Templars formed a distinguished part of this noble and gallant order. The Rule of the Poor Fellow-Soldiers of Jesus Christ and of the Temple of Solomon was drawn up by St. Bernard, and sanctioned by the Council of Troyes in 1127.¹⁹

The Grand Priors, or Provincial Masters, took an oath to defend with their lips, by force of arms, with all their strength and their life the mysteries of the Faith, &c. . . and the perpetual virginity before childbirth, in, and after childbirth, of the Blessed Virgin Marye, the daughter of Joachim and Anne of the tribe of Juda, and of the race of King David.²⁰

The Tower of London.

1. St. Peter *ad Vincula*.

In 1241 the King commands the keeper of the Tower works to have whitewashed the chancel of St. Marye in the Church of St. Peter, &c.; and the image of our Blessed Ladye (Mariola), with its tabernacle, to be coloured anew, and refreshed with good colours.

¹⁸ A facsimile of this inscription is given by Stow, bk. iii. p. 272; and by Addison, *History of the Knights Templars*: London, 1842, frontispiece.

¹⁹ Labbé, *Concilia*, t. x. col. 923.

²⁰ Henriquez, *Menologium Cisterciense*. Antv. 1639, p. 171; also Manrique, *Annales Cisterc.*: Lugd. 1642, p. 187.

Tested Windsor, 10 December 25 Henry III.,
1245.²¹

2. Chapel of St. John the Evangelist.
The same to the same.

"We command you . . . to whitewash the whole chapel of St. John the Evangelist in the great tower. And to make in the said chapel three glass windows, one, to wit, on the north part, with a certain small figure of Marye holding her child."

Tested, same place and date.²²

3. The White Chapel.

Similar orders are also given for a glass window with our Blessed Ladye.²³

Our Ladye of Graces, near the Tower.

In 1348 there was a great plague in London. It increased to such an extent, that, for want of space in the churchyards to bury the dead, one John Cory, clerk, procured of Nicholas, Prior of the Holy Trinity without Ealdgate (Aldgate) a toft of land near East Smithfield, for the burial of those who died, with the condition that it should be called the churchyard of the Holy Trinity. By the aid of devout citizens it was enclosed with a wall, and consecrated by Ralph Stratford, Bishop of London. Innumerable bodies were buried here, and a little chapel was erected to the honour of God.

During a storm at sea, and when in great danger, Edward the Third made a vow to build a monastery to the honour of God and Our Ladye of Graces, if God would grant him to come safe to land. He therefore built on this spot a monastery, which he caused to be called East-Minster, and placed in it an abbot and community of the Cistercian Order.

To them he gave all the messuages and appurtenances at Tower Hill which he had of John Cory aforesaid, in pure and perpetual alms, desiring this house to be called the Royal Free Chapel of St. Marye of Graces, by letters patent, tested at Westminster March 20, in the twenty-fourth year of our reign in England, and the eleventh of our reign in France—1350.²⁴

²¹ Librate Roll. 25 Henry III. m. 20.

²² *Ibid.*

²³ *Ibid.*

²⁴ Mon. Angl. V. p. 717.

They are to this effect:

"Edward, &c.

"Whilst with devout consideration we reflect on the various dangers to which on sundry occasions, as well by land and on sea, we have been, to all human appearance, exposed without any hope of escape, and on the lavish favours, with which, in these perils, the clemency of Christ on our invoking Him and the most Glorious Virgin His Mother, has mercifully prevented us, our heart burns within us, and we are inflamed with love for Jesus Christ our Lord Himself, and our Ladye His most beloved Mother Mary aforesaid. Desiring humbly to arrange something to their praise and glory, in memory of such favours, hoping that He, Who with so great favours mercifully prevented us, will always, through the affectionate mediation of His Mother, mercifully follow us up with an infusion of heavenly graces. Out of this consideration therefore, we have determined to found and endow, in the new cemetery of the Holy Trinity near our Tower of London, a House for the Monks of the Cistercian Order, which we will to be called the Free Chapel of Blessed Marye of Graces, to offer the sacrifice of praise and thanksgiving to God and our chief Protectress, the aforesaid most Blessed Marye, in a special manner. Know ye therefore," &c.

Those letters patent are recapitulated in the charter of Richard II., dated Nottingham, July 3, apparently in 1388; in which he confirms the foundation of his grandfather Edward, and recites and confirms the other donations.²⁵

Sir Nicholas de Lovaigne, knight, by his will dated 20th September, 1375, wills his body to be buried in the Abbey Church of Penshurst, otherwise in the Abbey of Our Lady of Grace, in London, near the Tower.²⁶

Our Ladye in West Cheap.

A cross used to stand in West Cheap, of which Stow says: "In the year 1581, the 21st of June, in the night, the lowest images round about the same cross (being of Christ's resurrection, of the Blessed Virgin Marye, King Edward the Confessor, and such like) were broken and

²⁵ Mon. Ang. V. p. 717.

²⁶ Test. Vet. p. 98.

defaced. Whereupon proclamation was made, that whoso would bewray the doers thereof should have forty crowns, but nothing came to light. The image of the Blessed Virgin, at that time, robbed of her Son, and her arms broken, by which she staid Him on her knees, her whole body was also haled with ropes and left ready to fall; but was in the year 1595 again fastened and repaired. And in the year 1596, about Bartholomew tide, a new son, misshapen (as born out of time) all naked, was laid in her arms, the other images remaining broken as before. On the east side of the same cross, the steps being taken thence, under the image of Christ's resurrection defaced, was then set up a curious wrought tabernacle of grey marble, and in the same an alabaster image of Diana."²⁷

About the 5th January, 1601, the image of our Ladye was again defaced, by plucking off her crown, and almost her head, taking from her her naked child, and stabbing her in the breast.²⁸

GOD'S HOUSES.

One example must suffice.

II. Sir Richard Whittington, who was four times Lord Mayor, built a College of the Holy Ghost and Saint Marye, and a God's House for thirteen poor men, one of them to be the tutor. The MS. Constitutions are in the archives of the Mercer's Company.

This is the ordinance in regard of prayers—

"Every tutour and poor folk, every day first whan they rise fro their bedds, kneeling upon their knees, sey a *Pater noster* and an *Ave Maria* with special and herty recommendacion-making of the foreseid Richard Whyttington and Alice to God and our Blessed Ladye Maidyn Marye. And other times of the day whan he may best and most commodly have leisure thereto, for the staat of al the souls abovesaid, say three or two sauters of our Lady at the least: that is to say, threies seven *Ave Marias*, with XV *Pater nosters*, and three *Credes*. But if he be letted with febleness or any other reasonable cawse, one in the day at the least, in case it may be: that is to say, after the Messe, or whan Complyn is

²⁷ *Survey*, bk. iii. p. 35.

²⁸ *Ibid.* p. 36.

don, they come togidder within the College about the tomb of the aforesaid Rich. Whyttington and Alice, and then they that can sey, shal sey for the souls of the said Richard and Alice, and for the souls of all Christen people, this psalm *de Profundis*, with the Versicles and Oriosons that longeth thereto. And they that can shal sey three *Ave Marias*, three *Pater nosters*, and oon *Crede*. And after this doon, the tutour, or oon of the eldest men of theym, shal sey openly in English, God have mercy on our founders' souls and al Chrysten. And they that stond about shal answer and sey Amen."²⁹

ALMSGIVING.

On a field to the east side of Houndsditch there were some small cottages two stories high, and little garden-plots behind, for poor bed-ridden people—for in that street dwelt none other—built by some Prior of the Holy Trinity, to whom that ground belonged. "In my youth," continues Stow, "I remember devout people, as well men as women, of this city were accustomed oftentimes, especially on Fridays, weekly, to walk that way purposely, and there to bestow their charitable alms, every poor man or woman lying in bed within their window, which was towards the street, open so low that every man might see them: a clean linen cloth lying in their window, and a pair of beads, to show that there lay a bed-ridden body, unable but to pray only."³⁰

HOSPITALS.

In London and the suburbs there were five hospitals called after our Blessed Ladye.

1. St. Mary in Barking

Was provided for poor priests and others, men and women in the city of London that were fallen into frenzy or loss of their memory, until such time as they should recover. It is now suppressed.³¹

2. St. Mary Bethlehem.

The magnificent hospital in Southwark, commonly called Bedlam, commemorates the pious

²⁹ *Survey*, bk. iii. p. 4.

³⁰ *Ibid.* bk. ii. p. 23.

³¹ *Ibid.* Appendix, p. 20.

foundation of Simon Fitz-Marye in 1247. He had been one of the sheriffs of London in the preceding year. It was originally founded for a priory of canons with brethren and sisters; and Edward the Third, in the fourteenth year of his reign, 1340—1341, granted a protection for the brethren *militiæ Beatæ Mariæ de Bethlehem* in the City of London. It was after a hospital for distracted people.³²

This is the foundation deed as given by Stow:

"To all, &c., Simon the son of Marye sendeth greeting in our Lord.

"Where among other things, and before other lands, the high altitude of the heavenly counsels, marvelously wrought by some readier devotion, it ought to be more worshipped: of which things the mortal sickness (after the fall of our first father Adam) hath taken the beginning of this new repairing. Therefore, indeed, it besemeth worthy that the place in which the Son of God is become Man, and hath proceeded from the Virgin's womb, which is increaser and beginner of man's redemption, namely ought to be with reverence worshipped, and with beneficial portions to be increased. Therefore it is that the said Simon, son of Marye, having special and singular devotion to the Church of the Glorious Virgin at Bethlehem, where the same Virgin of her brought forth our Saviour Incarnate, and lying in the cratch (*i.e.*, manger), and with her own milk nourished; and where the same Child to us then born, the chivalry of the heavenly company sang the new hymn, *Gloria in excelsis Deo*. The same time, the increaser of our health (as a King, and His Mother as a Queen) willed to be worshipped of kings; a new star going before them at the honour and reverence of the same Child and His most meek Mother, and to the exaltation of my most noble Lord, Henry King of England, whose wife and child the foresaid Mother of God and her only Son have in their keeping and protection: and to the manifold increase of this City of London in which I was born; and also for the health of my soul, &c. Have given, granted, and by this my present charter have confirmed to God and to the Church of St. Marye of Bethlehem all

³² *Survey*, bk. ii. p. 94.

my lands, &c." (here follows the enumeration). The foresaid church of Bethlehem to have and to hold in free and perpetual alms. And also to make there a priory, and to ordain a prior and canons, brothers, and also sisters, when Jesus Christ shall enlarge His grace upon it. And in the same place the Rule and Order of the said Church of Bethlehem solemnly professing, which shall bear the token of a star openly on their copes and mantles of profession, and to say Divine Service then for the souls aforesaid, and all Christian souls. . . . And in token of subjection and reverence, the said place in London without Bishopsgate, shall pay yearly in the said city a mark sterling at Easter to the Bishop of Bethlehem, his successors or his messengers, in the name of a pension. And if the faculties or goods of the said place (our Lord granting) happen to grow more, the said place shall pay more in the name of pension, at the said term, to the mother church of Bethlehem. This gift and confirmation of my deed, and the putting-to of my seal for me and mine heires I have steadfastly made strong, the year of our Lord one thousand two hundred forty seven, the Wednesday after the feast of St. Luke the Evangelist; these being witnesses, Peter the son of Allen, then Mayor of London, and many more."³³

The spot on which this hospital stood was called Old Bethlehem; now Liverpool Street.

In 1644, it was under consideration to enlarge the old hospital, but the situation was judged unfavourable: in 1675 the new hospital of Bethlehem was commenced near London Wall, to the south of the lower quarter of Little Moorfields; subsequently it was transferred to the other side of the river, where it now forms one of the chief features of Southwark.³⁴

The ancient seal represented the Assumption of our Blessed Ladye.³⁵

3. St. Mary Spital, or the New Hospital of Our Ladye.

This Priory and Hospital of our Blessed

³³ Bk. ii. p. 94. I have been unable to collate Stow's version with the original.

³⁴ Mon. Angl. vi. 621.

³⁵ Hearne's MS. Diaries, vol. cxxii. in the Bodleian Library, Oxford.

Ladye, commonly called Saint Marye Spittle, o. Spital, was founded by Walter Brune, a citizen of London, and Rosia, his wife in 1197. It was dedicated by William, Bishop of London, to the honour of Jesus Christ, and His Mother, the perpetual Virgin Marye, by the name of *Domus Dei et Beatæ Mariæ extra Bishopgate*. In 1235 it was refounded, and as a work *de novo*, and not relatively to any other foundation, received the title as above.³⁶ It surrendered to Henry VIII., and besides the ornaments of the Church, and other goods pertaining to the Hospital, there were found standing nine score beds well furnished for the receipt of the poor of charity. For, continues Stow, it was a hospital of great relief.³⁷

In the yard of St. Mary, Spital, stood the celebrated Pulpit Cross.

The later common seal represents our Blessed Ladye under a canopy, between two religious men, and surrounded by Cherubim.³⁸

4. St. Mary within Cripplegate was founded in 1329 by William Elsing, mercer, as a Hospital for one hundred blind men of the City of London.³⁹

5. St. Mary Rounceval, or Roncevalles, near Charing Cross.

William Marshal, Earl of Pembroke, having amongst other estates, given several tenements near Charing Cross to the Prior of Rouncevall, or *de Rosida Valle*, in the diocese of Pampeluna in Navarre, temp. Henry III., a Hospital or Chapel of St. Marye which was the chief house in England belonging to that foreign priory was erected on the site.⁴⁰

In 1614, Northumberland House, now a mansion of the past, was erected, and according to Newcourt, out of the ruins of this Hospital.⁴¹

THE TWELVE GREAT LIVERY COMPANIES.

Our Blessed Ladye was the Patroness of four of them; to wit:

1. The Skinners' Company, which was incorporated in the first year of Edward III., 1327,

³⁶ Mon. Angl. t. vi. p. 623.

³⁷ Bk. ii. p. 97.

³⁸ *Ib.*

³⁹ Stow, Append. p. 20.

⁴⁰ Mon. Angl. c. vi. p. 677.

⁴¹ Repertorium v. i. p. 693.

and made into a Brotherhood in the eighteenth of Richard II., 1394—1395.⁴²

2. The Clothworkers' Company, which was incorporated April 12, 1482, by the appellation of the Fraternity of the Assumption of the Blessed Virgin Marye of the Sheermen of the City of London.⁴³ Their annual feast and entertainment of meat and drink was held in a competent place on the festival of the Assumption of our Blessed Ladye.⁴⁴

3. The Drapers, as the Mother of the Lamb. They were incorporated in 1430.⁴⁵

4. The Mercers.⁴⁶

LUDGERSHALL
CASTLE.

In 1250 the Constable of Marlborough Castle is ordered . . . to place an image of Blessed Marye, with her child, in the King's chapel, in the Castle of Ludgershall.

Writ tested Clarendon, July 19.⁴⁷

In 1251 the Constable of Marlborough Castle is ordered . . . to make an image of Blessed Marye, with her child, in the chapel of St. Leonard in Ludgershall Castle.

Writ tested Marlborough, July 3.⁴⁸

LUDLOW.

There was a very remarkable example of a pendant pix or ciborium at Ludlow, which is described as "an image of or Ladye of Pytte for y^e Sacrament."⁴⁹

LYNN EPISCOPI,
now
LYNN REGIS,
or KING'S LYNN.

1. Our Ladye on the Mount.

Many offerings were made to the image of our Ladye, in her chapel on the Mount of Lynn, by pilgrims who visited it on their way to Walsingham.⁵⁰

This chapel is described as a very remarkable specimen of architecture; extreme length 17 feet, and width 14. The perfect form of a cross is

⁴² Herbert, *History of the Twelve Great Livery Companies of London*. Lond. 1836, v. ii. p. 299.

⁴³ *Ibid.* p. 643; and Stow. Bk. v. p. 198.

⁴⁴ Herbert. p. 651.

⁴⁵ *Ibid.* v. i. pp. 67, 391.

⁴⁶ *Ibid.* p. 226.

⁴⁷ Liberate Roll, 34 Henry III.

⁴⁸ *Ibid.* 35 Henry III.

⁴⁹ *Transactions of the London and Middlesex Archaeological Institute*, v. iv. p. 373.

⁵⁰ *Index. Mon. Dioc. Norw.* p. 66; and Preface, xx.

preserved, although it stands within an octagona wall; and another curious feature was that every one was obliged to make a complete circuit of the chapel before entering it.

Our Ladye's Gild at Lynn was founded in the third year of Edward III., 1329.

Great was the resort of pilgrims to this sanctuary, and the profits and offerings at the Chapel on the Mount are accounted as 16*l.* 10*s.* in the compotus of George Elyngham, prior of St. Margaret, in the first year of Henry VIII.⁵¹

2. Our Ladye on the Bridge.

Some small remains of this chapel converted into a little dwelling stood, till very lately, on the eastern side of the bridge.⁵²

MAYFIELD.

In 1471 William de Ponte bequeaths "towards a new picture of St. Marye of Maghfield xx*s.*, if the parishioners are willing to repaint the same."⁵³

MALTON.

Not far from Malton was a celebrated sanctuary of our Blessed Ladye, called Mount Grace. It is mentioned in the MS. account of the martyrdom of Father John Taylor, S.J., in 1642.⁵⁴

MANCHESTER.

The Cathedral.

Hollingworth mentions a large statue of St. George in the chapel called by that name, "the horse from which was," he says, "lately in the saddler's shop. The statues of the Virgin Marye, St. Dyonyse, the other patron saints, were upon the two highest pillars next to the quire; unto them men did bow at their coming into the church."⁵⁵

MARFORD, near ST. ALBAN'S.

In the third of Henry VI., 1424-5, one William, a tenant of the abbot's, being at Marford, and afflicted with blindness, in a spirit of devotion caused a wooden cross to be erected on the right hand side of the high road leading to Codicote over Marford Bridge; and near to it he placed a statue of our Blessed Ladye in alabaster.⁵⁶

⁵¹ *General History of Norfolk*, pp. 429-431.

⁵² *Ibid.* p. 431.

⁵³ *Test. Vetust.* p. 326.

⁵⁴ MS. Varia S.J. Cart. 29, in Bib. Reg. Bruxell.

⁵⁵ *Journal of British Archaeological Association*, v. iii. p. 197.

⁵⁶ *Chron. Mon. S. Albani*, v. i. p. 6. Rolls Edit.

MARLBOROUGH.

The Constable of Marlborough Castle is ordered to make . . . in the Queen's chapel a crucifix there with Marye and John, and Marye with her child.

Writ tested Clarendon, July 19.⁵⁷

MELFORD.

In the inventory of the ornaments belonging to the Church of the Holy Trinity are enumerated "coats belonging to our Ladye."

1. A coat for the good days, of cloth of tissue bordered with white; and for her Son, another of the same, in like case.

2. A coat of crimson velvet, and another for her Son, in like case.

3. A coat of white damask, and another for her Son, in like case, bordered about with green velvet.⁵⁸

I find this entry in the second of Edward VI., "*It*. Sold to Mr. Clopton the alt^r alebast^r in our ladye's chapell. vi.s. viii.d."⁵⁹

MESSINGHAM PARVA,
NORFOLK.

John P'Estrange, third son of Henry P'Estrange, of Hunstanton, by his will in 1516 bequeaths his body to be buried, if he died within five miles of Messingham, before our Blessed Ladye, in the chapel on the south side of the chancel of this church.⁶⁰

METTINGHAM,
SUFFOLK.

A piece of land called Nolloths was left to the College of Mettingham, to find a wax light, for ever to be burnt before the image of our Blessed Ladye in the choir of the chapel.⁶¹

About the year 1414, an image of our Blessed Ladye was sculptured, for which the wood appears to have been provided by Sir William Argentein; and Thomas Barsham, of Yarmouth, who is also called Thomas de Jernemuta, received in several payments, for making and painting two images, with tabernacles, and a *tabula* for the high altar, not less than 37*l.* 4*s.* 8*d.*⁶²

MIDDLEBOROUGH.

In 1453, Thomas Lynehouse of Leventhorpe, in Cleveland, leaves a support for the light of our

⁵⁷ Liberate Roll, 34 Henry III.

⁵⁸ *Notes and Queries* 3 Series, v. iii. p. 179.

⁵⁹ *Proceedings of Suffolk Archaeological Institute*, v. ii. p. 81.

⁶⁰ *General History of Norfolk*, p. 472.

⁶¹ Suckling, v. i. p. 177.

⁶² *Proceedings of Royal Archaeological Institute*, v. vi. p. 67.

Ladye in the parish church of St. Hilda of Middleburg.⁶³

MILDENHALL.

1. The image of our Ladye was by the high altar. In 1477, Thomas Chylderston bequeathed to the image of the most glorious Virgin Marye by the said altar, vi s. vii d.⁶⁴

2. The chapel of our Ladye over the porch.

In 1519, Thomas Marchanter of Mildenhall bequeathed "to the reparacon of the chapell of owre Ladye ovyr the porch, xx d.;" and in 1527, Alice Bateman left xii d. for the same object.⁶⁵

MISSINDEN,
BUCKS.

In the King's expenditure, July 27, third Henry the Eighth: "To Mast. Egerton for offering at our Ladye at Myssenden Abbey, 6 s. 8 d."⁶⁶

MOLESCROFT.

By will dated February 25, 1498, Agnes Hil-yard leaves to the image of our Blessed Ladye at Mollescroft, 3 s. 4 d. in gold to hang round her neck.⁶⁷

MOLSA.

Agnes, wife of William Bird of Beverley, by will dated the feast of St. Lambert, 1398, leaves half a piece *velorum de sipirs* to the image of the Blessed Virgin Marye over the door of the chapel in the woods of Molsa.⁶⁸

MOULTON S. MICHAEL,
or GT. MOULTON.
NORFOLK.

Here was a chapel of our Blessed Ladye with an altar, image, and light.⁶⁹

MOUNT BADON.

Guppenberg mentions in the *Atlas Marianus* a miraculous image of our Blessed Ladye under the title of *Imago B. V. M. miraculosa Regia de Monte Badonico*.⁷⁰ It was, however, the image of our Blessed Ladye which King Arthur had painted on his shield, and carried at the battle of Mount Badon; and which Guppenberg describes in another place as our Ladye *de Clypeo*. I have already referred to it.⁷¹

⁶³ Test. Ebor. vol. ii. p. 171.

⁶⁴ *Proceedings of Suffolk Archaeological Institute*, vol. i. p. 271.

⁶⁵ *Ibid.*

⁶⁶ Letters and Papers, &c. Henry VIII. vol. ii. pt. ii. p. 1452.

⁶⁷ Test. Ebor. vol. iv. p. 133.

⁶⁸ Test. Ebor. vol. i. p. 240.

⁶⁹ *General History of Norfolk*, 106.

⁷⁰ No. cccclxxxix. p. 591.

⁷¹ Vide p. 86.

The account of the battle is thus given by Florence of Worcester :

"The Saxons Colgrin, Bardulf, and Cheldric, repented of having made a truce with King Arthur, and assailed Mount Badon. The King ordered his troops to arms ; he himself put on his coat of mail, and donned his dragon-crested helmet. He slung on his shoulder his shield named Pridwen, in which the image of the Holy Mother of God painted thereon perpetually recalled her to his thoughts. He girded on his brave falchion Caliburn, and seized his lance called Iron with his right hand. Drawing up his forces, he boldly attacked the Pagans. They fought bravely, but when much of the day had been spent in fighting, at last King Arthur, drawing Caliburn, and invoking the name of the Blessed Virgin Marye, dashed into the serried ranks of the foe ; whomsoever he struck needed no second cut. He did not cease until eight hundred and forty of the enemy had fallen beneath his sharp-edged blade ! Colgrin and Bardulf perished, with many thousands of their followers ; Cheldric saved himself by flight."⁷² This victory the pious King attributed to the intercession of our Blessed Ladye.

MUSWELL.

On the hill which separates Hornsey from Finchley Common, and not far from the Alexandra Park stood the celebrated shrine of our Ladye of Muswell to which there was a continual resort of pilgrims. It was attached to the Priory of the Knights Hospitallers of St. John of Jerusalem at Clerkenwell, by Richard de Beauvais, Bishop of London in 1112.

In his *Speculum Britannie*, Norden says :

"There formerly stood at Muswell Hill, called Pinsenall, a chappell, sometime bearing the name of our Ladie of Muswell, where now Alderman Row hath erected a proper house ; the place taketh the name of the hall (Mousewell Hill) for there is on the hill a spring of faire water which is now within the compass of the house. There was for some time an image of the Ladye of Muswell, whereunto was a continued resort in the way of pilgrimage, growing as is (though as I take it) fabulously reported, in regard of a great cure

⁷² Ad. ann. 520, pp. 97, 98.

which was performed by this water upon a King of Scots, who, being strangely diseased, was by some divine intelligence advised to take the water of a well in England, called Muswell, which, after long scrupulation and inquisition, this well was found, and performed the cure; absolutely to deny the cure, I dare not, for that the High God hath given virtue unto waters to heale infirmities, as may appear by the cure of Naaman, the leper, by washing himself seven times in Jordan, and by the Poole Bethesda which healed the rest that stopped there, after it was moved by the Angell.⁷³

MUTFORD, SUFFOLK. Here the church had a gild and a light of our Ladye.

In 1401, Dame de Mutford, widow of Sir Edward de Hengrave, gave by her will vi s. viii d. to the light of our Ladye in Mutford church.⁷⁴

NEWARK.

John Burton, S.T.P., Vicar of Newark, says in his will, dated 29th September, 1475:

"I desire that certain collars, pairs of beads, rings, gems, crucifixes, and other jewels which appear in a list in the keeping of the churchwardens, remain for ever for the adorning of the image of the Blessed Virgin Marye and her Son, in the chapel beyond the south doors of the aforesaid church, in the honour of God, the Blessed Virgin Marye, and all the Saints."⁷⁵

NEWBURGH MONASTERY, YORKSHIRE.

Every day there was given and distributed to the poor an alms called *Ladymete*, and a measure of beer.⁷⁶

NEWENHAM, CAMBRIDGESHIRE.

Although I have found no mention of any shrine of our Blessed Ladye, or of lights and offerings at this place, still Newenham must not be omitted from this series, because here it was that the Scapular was instituted.

In 1249, Michael Malherbe gave the Carmelites a habitation at Newenham, just outside Cambridge, where they remained forty-two years. In 1291 they removed into the parish of St. John-Miln-Street, where they received great benefac-

⁷³ Vol. i. p. 653.

⁷⁵ Test. Ebor. vol. iii. p. 218.

⁷⁴ Suckling, v. i. p. 276.

⁷⁶ *Valor Ecclesiasticus*, t. v. p. 93.

tions from King Edward I., Sir Guy de Mortimer, and Thomas de Hertford.⁷⁷

Born in 1165, St. Simon Stock was admitted into the Carmelite Order in 1212; and in 1245 was named General by the Chapter held at Aylesford.

The celebrated vision occurred on the morning of the 16th July, 1251, before the break of day, and in the Carmelite Chapel at Newenham.

The principal authority is Father Peter Swynyngton, a Carmelite, and the confessor, companion, and secretary of St. Simon. He wrote the relation of the vision as dictated to him by the Saint, and on the day of its occurrence.

These are his words:

"The Blessed Simon, broken down by a lengthy old age and rigorous penance, and by bearing the troubles of his brethren in his heart, was diligently watching in prayer through the night, even until morning. And whilst thus making his prayer, he received a consolation from heaven, which he thus narrated to us in community:

"Most dear Brothers, Blessed be God, Who does not abandon those who hope in Him, nor despise their prayers! Blessed, the most Holy Mother of Christ Jesus our Lord, who, mindful of the days of old, and of the tribulations which have found many of you exceedingly (not considering that all who desire to lead a devout life in Jesus Christ suffer persecutions), sends you a message which you will receive in the joy of the Holy Ghost: may He direct me that I may make it known to you in the manner in which it behoves me to speak.

"Whilst I was pouring out my soul in the sight of the Lord, dust and ashes as I am, and praying with full confidence to our Ladye the Blessed Virgin Marye, that, since she wished us to be called her brothers, she would show herself a Mother to us, by delivering us from the danger of temptations and recommending us by some SIGN of favour to those who were persecuting us, saying to her with sighs—

Flos Carmeli,
Vitis florigera,

⁷⁷ *Mon. Angl.* vi. p. 1570.

Splendor coeli,
 Virgo puerpera
 Singularis.
 Mater mitis,
 Sed viri nescia,
 Carmelitis
 Da privilegia.
 Stella maris.

"She appeared to me attended by a great retinue, and holding in her hands the habit of the Order—*habitum ordinis*—said :

"*Hoc erit tibi et cunctis Carmelitis privilegium. In hoc moriens æternum non patietur incendium.*"

Swanyngton continues :

"He sent this same message to the brethren who were in other places very sorrowful, as a letter of consolation, which I, undeserving as I am, wrote at the dictation of the man of God, so that they might return thanks altogether by prayer and perseverance. At Cambridge, on the morrow of the Separation of the Apostles (16 July), 1251."⁷⁸

St. Simon Stock died in 1265, at the age of a hundred years, in the house of his Order at Bordeaux. His death-song was the Angelic Salutation. When the controversies about the Carmelite Order were started in the seventeenth century, an autograph copy of Father Swanyngton's letter was found in the archives of the convent at Bordeaux.⁷⁹

⁷⁸ *Vinea Carmeli*, n. 751, pp. 390 *et seq.* : *Speculum Carmelitanum*, t. ii. p. 429, n. 1515 ; *Menologium Carmelitanum*. Bononiæ, 1628 ; p. 292.

⁷⁹ Benedict XIV. *De Festis*, l. ii. c. vi. § 8. De Festo B.M. de Monte Carmelo.

ST. JOSEPH'S
CATHOLIC LENDING LIBRARY,

50, South Street, Grosvenor Square.

OPEN DAILY FROM HALF-PAST TEN TO FIVE O'CLOCK.

NEW BOOKS FOR SEPTEMBER.

- Canon Shortland's Persecutions of Annam.*
The Preaching of the Beatitudes. (Public Life of our Lord, Vol. II.)
Molloy's Autumn Holiday on French Rivers.
Recollections of Colonel de Gonneville.
Lettres Spirituelles du R. P. le Jeune. Vol. III.
Souvenirs du Pays de St. Térèse.
Sermons by Fathers of the Society of Jesus. Vol. III.
The Story of a Soul. By Mrs. Craven.
Secret Warfare of Freemasonry against Church and State.
Tennyson's Queen Mary.
Sir A. de Vere's Mary Tudor.
Vie du B. B. J. Labré. Par Léon Aubineau.
Avenham Priory.
The Story of St. Stanislaus Kostka.
Donoso Cortés. Essays on Catholicism, &c.
Vie du R. Père Olivaint.
Life of O'Connell. By the Rev. J. O'Rourke.
Life of Father Bernard.
Nano Nagle, her Life and Labours.
Notice sur le R. P. Claude de la Colombière.
Remarks on a late Assailant of the Society of Jesus.
Cardinal Manning's Internal Working of the Holy Ghost.
Chronicle of St. Antony of Padua (when out).
The Troubles of our Catholic Forefathers. (New Series.)
Dr. Newman's Letter to the Duke of Norfolk (and postscript).
Allies' Formation of Christendom. Vol. III.
Father Bridgett's Our Lady's Dowry.
Smith's Assyrian Discoveries.
Father Surin's Spiritual Letters.
S. Louis et ses Temps. Wallon.
Peace through the Truth. Father Harper. (Second Series.)
Histoire de l'Eglise de Corée.
Characteristics of Dr. Newman. By W. S. Lilly.
The Orphan Sisters.
Sidney Flint.
A New Model for Youth.

CONTENTS.

SEPTEMBER, 1875.

ARTICLES, &c. :—

1. Structure of St. Matthew's Gospel. Part III. *By the Rev. H. J. Coleridge.*
2. Some Notes in Greece.
3. "Tout est dit" (La Bruyère). *By W. C. Bryant.*
4. St. Jerome and his Correspondence. Part IV. *By the Rev. J. M'Sweeney.*
5. The Ruthenian Church. I.—Its Conversion. *By the Rev. F. Goldie.*
6. The Discovery of St. Antony.
7. Mazzini and Young Italy. *By the Rev. T. B. Parkinson.*
8. Mr. Mill on Theism. Argument for a First Cause. *By the Rev. J. Rickaby.*
9. Freemasonry. (*Communicated.*)

CATHOLIC REVIEW.

- I. Selections from Foreign Catholic Periodicals.
St. Gregory the Seventh. *By the Count de Montalembert.* Part III.
- II. Reviews and Notices.
- III. Old English Devotion to our Blessed Lady. Part IX.—*London—Newenham, Cambridgeshire.*

*** Vol. XXIV. is now ready. Cases for Binding can be had at the Publishers.*

All Advertisements to be sent to Mr. J. STANLEY, Manresa Press, Roehampton, S.W.

JOHN HARDMAN AND COMPANY,
BIRMINGHAM,
Medieval Metal Workers in Silver, Brass & Wrought Iron,
MAKERS OF MEMORIAL BRASSES AND COFFIN FURNITURE,
ARTISTS IN STAINED GLASS,
Ecclesiastical Decorators, Carvers in Wood and Stone,
MEDALLISTS AND LITHOGRAPHERS.

JOHN HARDMAN AND CO. beg to draw attention to the WROUGHT IRON CHANCEL SCREENS they have erected in the Churches at Stone, Rugeley, and Rugby, which, while separating the Sanctuary from the Body of the Church, do not impede the view of the Altar; to the ROODS IN CARVED WOOD, either suspended from the Chancel Arch, as at St. Francis Xavier's, Liverpool, and Great Harwood, Lancashire, or supported by the Screen, as at Rugby; to their MEDALS made to special design, in silver, bronze, brass, and tin; and to their MORTUARY PAPERS, which bear special reference to the deceased.

J. H. and Co. are also Workers in the Medieval Style of Furniture and Articles for Domestic use.

LITHOGRAPHED FIRST COMMUNION CARDS, 10s. per Hundred.

LONDON AGENTS :
BURNS AND OATES, 17, PORTMAN STREET, W.

ROEHAMPTON: PRINTED BY JAMES STANLEY.

